MILLERITES AND EARLY ADVENTISTS SECTION 5 REEL 1 OF 13

MILLERITES AND EARLY ADVENTISTS

Section 5: Extant periodicals from 1831-circa 1869. (Millerite, anti-Millerite and Adventist publications.)

ADVENT Christian quarterly. v1-2; July 1869-April 1871. Buchanan, Mich., Western Advent Christian Publishing Association.

Advent Christian Quarterly

Volumes 1-2

July 1869-April 1871

Reel 1 of 13

MILLERITES AND EARLY ADVENTISTS SECTION 5 REEL 1 OF 13

MILLERITES AND EARLY ADVENTISTS

Section 5: Extant periodicals from 1831-circa 1869. (Millerite, anti-Millerite and Adventist publications.)

ADVENT Christian quarterly. v1-2; July 1869-April 1871. Buchanan, Mich., Western Advent Christian Publishing Association.

Advent Christian Quarterly

Volumes 1-2

July 1869-April 1871

Reel 1 of 13

TERMS OF THE QUARTERLY.

THE QUARTERLY is issued in July, October, January and April. Each number contains 80 pp. Subscriptions may commence with any number.

Single copy, one year,	$1.00
Five copies " " to one address	4.00
Ten " " " " "	6.00
Single copies	.30

To ministers, 50c., a volume of four numbers.

Any person sending a new subscriber for the *Advent Times*, for one year, shall be entitled to THE QUARTERLY for 75c.

Any person sending four subscribers to THE QUARTERLY for one year, shall receive a copy for one year, free.

Any person sending five subscribers to the *Times* for one year, shall receive THE QUARTERLY, FREE.

Communications may be addressed to either of the editors, as follows: James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y; or, Wm. L. Himes, Buchanan, Mich.

All business letters should be addressed to

JOSHUA V. HIMES, Buchanan, Mich.

N. B.—A few copies of Volume I. bound, for sale, at $2 a volume. Unbound, $1.25.

Volume II. bound, $1.50. Unbound, $1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. I.

No. 1. JULY, 1869.

An Apology. By Eld. Joshua V. Himes.
Letter from A. A. Phelps; Early corruption of Christian Doctrine; Experience in the "Christian" church; Introduction of Destructionist views among Adventists; Importance of the question overlooked. Re-examination of the subject; Human sympathy—extract from Edwards; The Fathers—the spell broken. pp. 3–11.

Truth and Love. By Samuel Minton, M. A.
Destructionist views no ground for the withdrawal of Christian fellowship. pp. 11–14.

Christianity vs. Churchianity. By Eld. A. A. Phelps.
An age of counterfeits; The true and the nominal church; Christ and the Church not identical; Christian worship and church worship not identical; Worship by proxy; Christian fellowship and church fellowship not identical; Churchianity defined. pp. 14–19.

Paul's "Desire to Depart." By Thomas Davidson.
Assertions and charges are not arguments; the question stated; ANALUSAI defined; Paul's "strait;" the "burning desire;" Is Paul self-consistent? ANALUO—its usage; Christ's language; A reviewer in an awkward position; Paul to the Thessalonians; Peter's language; Did Paul use deceptive or careless language? Who are Sadducees? The time of reward; "This earthly house;" "Absent from the body;" The better way. pp. 19–31.

The Kingdom of God. By L. C. Collins.
The question stated; The only safe principle of interpretation; Facts justify literal interpretation; The kingdom of God literal and with locality; Shadow and substance; The three worlds; The great image; The "stone" kingdom—to stand forever; The stone does not symbolize the gospel; Daniel ch. 7; The kingdom "at hand;" Objections considered—Mat. 16:28; Mk. 9:1; Lk. 17:21; Jno. 18:36; Rom. 14:17; Col. 1:13; The parables illustrative of the kingdom—Mat. 13:33; 13:31, 32; Hope centers in the second advent. pp. 31–49

An Approaching Change. North British Review. p. 49.

Life and Death. By James H. Whitmore.
The terms defined and illustrated: Panton Ham on the use of the terms; Abp. Whately; Matteson's mistake; Conclusive testimony; Pres. Dwight's admission; Orthodoxy against the Bible; The Life-giver; A magnificent destiny; Destruction of death; Reason of the unpopularity of the doctrine of the Advent. pp. 50–63.

The Signs. (Sel.) By H. Bonar.
Night cometh—the day at hand; The signs notable and numerous; The diffu-

TERMS OF THE QUARTERLY.

THE QUARTERLY is issued in July, October, January and April. Each number contains 80 pp. Subscriptions may commence with any number.

Single copy, one year,	$1.00
Five copies " " to one address	4.00
Ten " " " " "	6.00
Single copies	.30

To ministers, 50c., a volume of four numbers.

Any person sending a new subscriber for the *Advent Times*, for one year, shall be entitled to THE QUARTERLY for 75c.

Any person sending four subscribers to THE QUARTERLY for one year, shall receive a copy for one year, free.

Any person sending five subscribers to the *Times* for one year, shall receive THE QUARTERLY, FREE.

Communications may be addressed to either of the editors, as follows: James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y; or, Wm. L. Himes, Buchanan, Mich.

All business letters should be addressed to

JOSHUA V. HIMES, Buchanan, Mich.

N. B.—A few copies of Volume I. bound, for sale, at $2 a volume. Unbound, $1.25.

Volume II. bound, $1.50. Unbound, $1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. I.

No. 1. JULY, 1869.

An Apology. By Eld. Joshua V. Himes.
Letter from A. A. Phelps; Early corruption of Christian Doctrine; Experience in the "Christian" church; Introduction of Destructionist views among Adventists; Importance of the question overlooked. Re-examination of the subject; Human sympathy—extract from Edwards; The Fathers—the spell broken. pp. 3–11.

Truth and Love. By Samuel Minton, M. A.
Destructionist views no ground for the withdrawal of Christian fellowship. pp. 11–14.

Christianity vs. Churchianity. By Eld. A. A. Phelps.
An age of counterfeits; The true and the nominal church; Christ and the Church not identical; Christian worship and church worship not identical; Worship by proxy; Christian fellowship and church fellowship not identical; Churchianity defined. pp. 14–19.

Paul's "Desire to Depart." By Thomas Davidson.
Assertions and charges are not arguments; the question stated; ANALUSAI defined; Paul's "strait;" the "burning desire;" Is Paul self-consistent? ANALUO—its usage; Christ's language; A reviewer in an awkward position; Paul to the Thessalonians; Peter's language; Did Paul use deceptive or careless language? Who are Sadducees? The time of reward; "This earthly house;" "Absent from the body;" The better way. pp. 19–31.

The Kingdom of God. By L. C. Collins.
The question stated; The only safe principle of interpretation; Facts justify literal interpretation; The kingdom of God literal and with locality; Shadow and substance; The three worlds; The great image; The "stone" kingdom—to stand forever; The stone does not symbolize the gospel; Daniel ch. 7; The kingdom "at hand;" Objections considered—Mat. 16:28; Mk. 9:1; Lk. 17:21; Jno. 18:36; Rom. 14:17; Col. 1:13; The parables illustrative of the kingdom—Mat. 13:33; 13:31, 32; Hope centers in the second advent. pp. 31–49

An Approaching Change. North British Review. p. 49.

Life and Death. By James H. Whitmore.
The terms defined and illustrated: Panton Ham on the use of the terms; Abp. Whately; Matteson's mistake; Conclusive testimony; Pres. Dwight's admission; Orthodoxy against the Bible; The Life-giver; A magnificent destiny; Destruction of death; Reason of the unpopularity of the doctrine of the Advent. pp. 50–63.

The Signs. (Sel.) By H. Bonar.
Night cometh—the day at hand; The signs notable and numerous; The diffu-

tion of infidelity; Increase of immorality; Prevalence of formalism; Strange mixture of opinions; Wars, rumors of wars, earthquakes, etc.; General restlessness; Missions; Prevalent disbelief; The spread of knowledge; General review of the situation. pp. 64–76.
Editorial.
THE QUARTERLY—Its purpose and objects; Our contributors; Dr. Charles K. True on Punishment.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1869.

The Comforting Hope. By O. R. Fassett, M. D.
The resurrection of Christ the foundation of all hope of a future existence; The dead who are "brought again"—Landis on Bush; Are the souls asleep? Primitive and modern phraseology—the difference between them; Phil. 1: 22, 23; 2 Cor. 5: 2–4; Tradition added to Scripture; Gibbon, Hudson, Tyndall; The hopeless sorrow of the heathen—illustrated by extracts and epitaphs; "Sorrow NOT without hope;" The "Styx" and Jordan; Testimony of the Catacombs of Rome, with quotations; Modern epitaphs; Whately on the intermediate state. pp. 82–106.
First things and first thoughts on Awaking. Anon. pp. 106–114.
Evening by Evening. Poetry. H. Bonar. p. 115
The Trinity. An historical sketch by E. Royce. pp. 116–124.
Has He Come? By Eld. Geo. Thomson.
The coming personal; In the clouds; With angels; Resurrection; Judgment; Time of reward; Enthroned. pp. 125–132.
Missionary Theology. By Rev. Edward White.
The dearth of interest in missions; Skepticism as to the theory on which they are established; Influence of the dogma of endless misery; Its evils clearly stated; Life in Christ and the personal Advent the true missionary doctrines. pp. 132–141.
The Second Advent.
Importance of the topic; Its nature; EPIPHANIA—PAROUSIA; Time of the Advent; Preceding signs; Practical moral bearing of the doctrine. pp. 141–150.
Editorial.
"The Doctrine of Immortality;" How THE QUARTERLY is received; The central truth; The Duke of Argyll on the generation of thought. pp. 159–160.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1870.

The Gospel Preached to Abraham. By Wm. L. Himes.
Judaism defined; Its fundamental error; The Judaizers of Galatia; The Gospel—what it includes; Preached to Abram; The original promises—what they included; Abram's "whereby;" No new reasoning; The fulfillment of the typical promise; The accurate performance of God's words; The promises of eternal things; A popular error; The inheritance—its extent; the consummation. pp. 161–182.
The Blissful Vision. A poem, by J. Albert Libby. p. 183.
The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.
Future punishment certain; Its duration positively endless; Its nature, death or extinction of being; The origin and growth of the torment dogma; Perversions of words; The language of both Testaments; The sense of Greek and Hebrew terms; Paul's willingness to be accursed; The vengeance of eternal fire; Origenism a consequence of Augustinianism—the one common ground of both systems considered; The final extinction of evil. pp. 184–216.
The Saints Joy and Sorrow. (Sel.) pp. 216–218.
The Use and Value of the term "Aion." Abridged from DeQuincy, by Jas. H. Whitmore. pp. 219–222.
The Return of Christ and the Hope of the Early Church. The Rainbow.
The Advent—its paramount importance in the minds of the Apostolic church. pp. 223–229.
Ascension Robes. By Wm. L. Himes.
Rise of the scandal; The true "Ascension Robe;" The "Wedding Garment;" Respectable endorsements of the falsehood; Unjustifiable course of the NEW Encyclopedia; Its inconsistencies; Orvis and Doesticks; Proof demanded in vain; Not ashamed of our hope. pp. 230–237.
Editorial.
Bible materialism gaining ground; Wm. Miller; Our future rest. pp. 239–240.

No. 4. APRIL, 1870.

Immaterialism. By William Sheldon.
The Bible statement of immortality; The soul; Evil results of immortal-soulism; Catholicism; Mohammedanism; Mormonism; Necromancy; Transmigration; Hero-worship; Indian theology; Spiritism; Universalism; Endless torments; Denial of the resurrection; Denial of the personal Advent; Rewards before judgment; A sky-kingdom; The testimony summed up. pp. 241–264.
The Throne of David. By Eld. Frank Burr.
The covenant with David; Historical record; David's throne restored; All Israel saved. pp. 265–271.
A Review of Prof. Bartlett's "Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation." By Rev. Henry Constable.
Tribute to the Professor's ability; The "indispensable" word; Is its use sophistry? Fighting a man of straw; Whoever taught absolute annihilation? A charge refuted; A serious misrepresentation; The real point of difference; A revival of Manichæism; The claims of reason; Primary and secondary meanings; A false law of lingual interpretation; A challenge; Attempt to create prejudice, for a subsequent purpose; The appeal to lexicographers; The argument on judicial grounds—tropes not allowed in the construction of laws; Prof. Bartlett "hoisted with his own petard;" A clear definition fatal to error; Bartlett against the Scriptures; A foul slander against God; Horrible results of the premises laid down. pp. 272–290.

Errors of the Age. (Sel.) Bonar. pp. 291–304.
Hades and Heaven. By James H. Whitmore.
The mutual opposition of immaterialists—Clarke, Scott, Barnes, Bartlett, Matteson, Benson, Edwards, Fitch, J. Wesley; The conservative and radical theories; Each theory eats the other up; What say the Scriptures? The poets not good theologians; Barnes against Paul; Fitch's Spiritism; The dead unconscious. pp. 305–316.
Would Earth Contain its Resurrected Inhabitants? pp. 316–318.
Editorial.
Whedon on "Christian Sadducees;" A defence. pp. 318–320.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. II.

No. 1. JULY, 1870.

Loss and Gain. By A. A. Phelps, A. M.
What loss did Adam sustain in Eden? When will that loss be regained? Paradise; The favor of God lost; Purity lost; A happy home gone; Dominion lost; Life lost; Adam, himself, without hope; His posterity have hope; All that was lost in the disobedience of Adam to be restored through Christ; The whole earth to become Paradise. pp. 1–18.
The Restitution. By Eld. O. R. Fassett.
Paradise lost; Postdiluvian Migrations; Ruins of ancient lands and cities; The Northwestern settlements; A new continent; Dissatisfaction and unrest; Increased emigration; Earth's destruction; The time of restoration; The change near. pp. 19–32.
Object of the Present Dispensation. By Dr. McNeile. p. 32.
The Kingdom of God. By Wm. L. Himes.
The prophetic outline of history; The four successive kingdoms; Perversion of symbolism; The "stone" to destroy, not assimilate; Explanation of the phrase, flesh and blood; The kingdom not of this world; Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; The kingdom under the whole heaven; The Whitbyan theory overturned; The relatives of Christ before Domitian; A part often taken for the whole. Supposed objections considered, Rom. 14: 7, 1 Cor. 6: 9, 1 Cor. 4: 20, Col. 1: 13, "At hand," The transfiguration, Peter's interpretation, The kingdom within you, The kingdom now nigh at hand. pp. 33–49.
A Question for the Times. (Sel.)
Leaven—does it ever symbolize good? A negative answer, Objections considered, The work of the leaven about complete. pp. 49–56.
The Stumbling Block. By Rev. Samuel Minton.
The dogma of eternal evil the greatest of stumbling stones, Illustrations, The love of God, The removal of the offence, What Christ has done for the race, The dogma unreasonable and impossible to be true. pp. 57–68.
The Witch of Endor. (Sel.) By Prof. Walter Scott.
Saul deceived, Samuel not present at the interview, the truth demonstrated. pp. 67–75.
Editorial.
The name "Christian," Its origin, Proper and improper use.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1870.

The Time of Reward. By Wm. L. Himes.
The popular belief, Its modifications, Character and object of the judgment, the only consistent theory, Is heaven to be our home, the type of the high priest, Saints and angels, Paul's materialism, Agreement of Christ, prophets and apostles, the Revelator's testimony, the resurrect on the time of reward. pp. 81–92.
The Final Punishment. By Rev. Willis Truthlover.
Reasons for writing, Principles of interpretation, Malachi's testimony, Burning up the chaff, Everlasting fire, the worm and fire, "Consume," Soul and body destroyed, Everlasting destruction, Everlasting punishment, Smoke of torment, Whence came the common doctrine? Man a living, not an immortal soul. pp. 92–105.
The Davidic Covenant. By Wm. L. Himes.
The sure mercies of David, the Davidic promises, David's throne overturned, the branch, Messiah's kingdom, the Jews'

UMI

tion of infidelity; Increase of immorality; Prevalence of formalism; Strange mixture of opinions; Wars, rumors of wars, earthquakes, etc.; General restlessness; Missions; Prevalent disbelief; The spread of knowledge; General review of the situation. pp. 64–76.
Editorial.
THE QUARTERLY—Its purpose and objects; Our contributors; Dr. Charles K. True on Punishment.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1869.

The Comforting Hope. By O. R. Fassett, M. D.
The resurrection of Christ the foundation of all hope of a future existence; The dead who are "brought again"—Landis on Bush; Are the souls asleep? Primitive and modern phraseology—the difference between them; Phil. 1: 22, 23; 2 Cor. 5: 2–4; Tradition added to Scripture; Gibbon, Hudson, Tyndall; The hopeless sorrow of the heathen—illustrated by extracts and epitaphs; "Sorrow NOT without hope;" The "Styx" and Jordan; Testimony of the Catacombs of Rome, with quotations; Modern epitaphs; Whately on the intermediate state. pp. 82–106.
First things and first thoughts on Awaking. Anon. pp. 106–114.
Evening by Evening. Poetry. H. Bonar. p. 115
The Trinity. An historical sketch by E. Royce. pp. 116–124.
Has He Come? By Eld. Geo. Thomson.
The coming personal; In the clouds; With angels; Resurrection; Judgment; Time of reward; Enthroned. pp. 125–132.
Missionary Theology. By Rev. Edward White.
The dearth of interest in missions; Skepticism as to the theory on which they are established; Influence of the dogma of endless misery; Its evils clearly stated; Life in Christ and the personal Advent the true missionary doctrines. pp. 132–141.
The Second Advent.
Importance of the topic; Its nature; EPIPHANIA—PAROUSIA; Time of the Advent; Preceding signs; Practical moral bearing of the doctrine. pp. 141–150.
Editorial.
"The Doctrine of Immortality;" How THE QUARTERLY is received; The central truth; The Duke of Argyll on the generation of thought. pp. 159–160.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1870.

The Gospel Preached to Abraham. By Wm. L. Himes.
Judaism defined; Its fundamental error; The Judaizers of Galatia; The Gospel—what it includes; Preached to Abram; The original promises—what they included; Abram's "whereby;" No new reasoning; The fulfillment of the typical promise; The accurate performance of God's words; The promises of eternal things; A popular error; The inheritance—its extent; the consummation. pp. 161–182.
The Blissful Vision. A poem, by J. Albert Libby. p. 183.
The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.
Future punishment certain; Its duration positively endless; Its nature, death or extinction of being; The origin and growth of the torment dogma; Perversions of words; The language of both Testaments; The sense of Greek and Hebrew terms; Paul's willingness to be accursed; The vengeance of eternal fire; Origenism a consequence of Augustinianism—the one common ground of both systems considered; The final extinction of evil. pp. 184–216.
The Saints Joy and Sorrow. (Sel.) pp. 216–218.
The Use and Value of the term "Aion." Abridged from DeQuincy, by Jas. H. Whitmore. pp. 219–222.
The Return of Christ and the Hope of the Early Church. The Rainbow.
The Advent—its paramount importance in the minds of the Apostolic church. pp. 223–229.
Ascension Robes. By Wm. L. Himes.
Rise of the scandal; The true "Ascension Robe;" The "Wedding Garment;" Respectable endorsements of the falsehood; Unjustifiable course of the NEW Encyclopedia; Its inconsistencies; Orvis and Doesticks; Proof demanded in vain; Not ashamed of our hope. pp. 230–237.
Editorial.
Bible materialism gaining ground; Wm. Miller; Our future rest. pp. 239–240.

No. 4. APRIL, 1870.

Immaterialism. By William Sheldon.
The Bible statement of immortality; The soul; Evil results of immortal-soulism; Catholicism; Mohammedanism; Mormonism; Necromancy; Transmigration; Hero-worship; Indian theology; Spiritism; Universalism; Endless torments; Denial of the resurrection; Denial of the personal Advent; Rewards before judgment; A sky-kingdom; The testimony summed up. pp. 241–264.
The Throne of David. By Eld. Frank Burr.
The covenant with David; Historical record; David's throne restored; All Israel saved. pp. 265–271.
A Review of Prof. Bartlett's "Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation." By Rev. Henry Constable.
Tribute to the Professor's ability; The "indispensable" word; Is its use sophistry? Fighting a man of straw; Whoever taught absolute annihilation? A charge refuted; A serious misrepresentation; The real point of difference; A revival of Manichæism; The claims of reason; Primary and secondary meanings; A false law of lingual interpretation; A challenge; Attempt to create prejudice, for a subsequent purpose; The appeal to lexicographers; The argument on judicial grounds—tropes not allowed in the construction of laws; Prof. Bartlett "hoisted with his own petard;" A clear definition fatal to error; Bartlett against the Scriptures; A foul slander against God; Horrible results of the premises laid down. pp. 272–290.

Errors of the Age. (Sel.) Bonar. pp. 291–304.
Hades and Heaven. By James H. Whitmore.
The mutual opposition of immaterialists—Clarke, Scott, Barnes, Bartlett, Matteson, Benson, Edwards, Fitch, J. Wesley; The conservative and radical theories; Each theory eats the other up; What say the Scriptures? The poets not good theologians; Barnes against Paul; Fitch's Spiritism; The dead unconscious. pp. 305–316.
Would Earth Contain its Resurrected Inhabitants? pp. 316–318.
Editorial.
Whedon on "Christian Sadducees;" A defence. pp. 318–320.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. II.

No. 1. JULY, 1870.

Loss and Gain. By A. A. Phelps, A. M.
What loss did Adam sustain in Eden? When will that loss be regained? Paradise; The favor of God lost; Purity lost; A happy home gone; Dominion lost; Life lost; Adam, himself, without hope; His posterity have hope; All that was lost in the disobedience of Adam to be restored through Christ; The whole earth to become Paradise. pp. 1–18.
The Restitution. By Eld. O. R. Fassett.
Paradise lost; Postdiluvian Migrations; Ruins of ancient lands and cities; The Northwestern settlements; A new continent; Dissatisfaction and unrest; Increased emigration; Earth's destruction; The time of restoration; The change near. pp. 19–32.
Object of the Present Dispensation. By Dr. McNeile. p. 32.
The Kingdom of God. By Wm. L. Himes.
The prophetic outline of history; The four successive kingdoms; Perversion of symbolism; The "stone" to destroy, not assimilate; Explanation of the phrase, flesh and blood; The kingdom not of this world; Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; The kingdom under the whole heaven; The Whitbyan theory overturned; The relatives of Christ before Domitian; A part often taken for the whole. Supposed objections considered, Rom. 14: 7, 1 Cor. 6: 9, 1 Cor. 4: 20, Col. 1: 13, "At hand," The transfiguration, Peter's interpretation, The kingdom within you, The kingdom now nigh at hand. pp. 33–49.
A Question for the Times. (Sel.)
Leaven—does it ever symbolize good? A negative answer, Objections considered, The work of the leaven about complete. pp. 49–56.
The Stumbling Block. By Rev. Samuel Minton.
The dogma of eternal evil the greatest of stumbling stones, Illustrations, The love of God, The removal of the offence, What Christ has done for the race, The dogma unreasonable and impossible to be true. pp. 57–68.
The Witch of Endor. (Sel.) By Prof. Walter Scott.
Saul deceived, Samuel not present at the interview, the truth demonstrated. pp. 67–75.
Editorial.
The name "Christian," Its origin, Proper and improper use.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1870.

The Time of Reward. By Wm. L. Himes.
The popular belief, Its modifications, Character and object of the judgment, the only consistent theory, Is heaven to be our home, the type of the high priest, Saints and angels, Paul's materialism, Agreement of Christ, prophets and apostles, the Revelator's testimony, the resurrect on the time of reward. pp. 81–92.
The Final Punishment. By Rev. Willis Truthlover.
Reasons for writing, Principles of interpretation, Malachi's testimony, Burning up the chaff, Everlasting fire, the worm and fire, "Consume," Soul and body destroyed, Everlasting destruction, Everlasting punishment, Smoke of torment, Whence came the common doctrine? Man a living, not an immortal soul. pp. 92–105.
The Davidic Covenant. By Wm. L. Himes.
The sure mercies of David, the Davidic promises, David's throne overturned, the branch, Messiah's kingdom, the Jews'

UMI

error not literalism, the parable of the nobleman, Rev. 1 : 9, the PALINGENESIA and APOCATASTASIS, the glorious reality. pp. 105–116.

Stuart on Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.

Not a work for the times, the republishers unwise, Its force is against Origen s theory, It assumes the point now in dispute, Man made in the image of God, Stuart's admissions, the appeal from Stuart to Stuart, the light of nature, A challenge. pp. 117–125.

The popular Superstition. By Eld. O. R. Fassett.

What is a ghost ? the children's discussion, Christian superstition, the Church Hellenized, Scripture necrology, the witch at Endor, Eliphaz' vision, Angels not human spirits, Ghost-stories, Appeal to the Scriptures. pp. 126–147.

Life and Immortality only in Christ. Rainbow. pp. 148–150.

The Principle of Interpretation. By Henry Constable. pp. 150–151.

The Doom of the Unjust. By Henry Constable.

A review of Mr. Pridham, exposing several popular errors upon the subject indicated. pp. 151–162.

Editorial. pp. 163–164.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1871.

Ancient Jewish Knowledge of the Future State. By Edward Falconer Litton.

Their sources of information, the immortality dogma unknown to the Jews, the Law, Division of opinion, Influence of Grecian philosophy, Life and immortality brought to light. pp. 1–9.

Satan's Estimate of Sin. (Sel.) pp. 9–15.

Is the Soul a Separate Entity ? By Jas. H. Whitmore.

The subject opened, Mr. Clark's position, the once-in-seven-years-change theory exploded, Intuitions of duality, an assumed absurdity, testimony of consciousness, relations of mind to the body, appeal to the Creator, the phenomena of death, various objections considered—their weakness exposed, Facts vs. Assertion, Qualities of matter not yet fully understood. pp. 15–42.

The Burial of Moses. Poetry. pp. 42–43.

The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life. By Rev. Wm. Leask.

Our right to question interpretations, God's honor involved, Scripture reveals a future life, it is not by nature, is connected with the resurrection, true progression, the glorious prospect. pp. 44–56.

The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment in its Relations to Ethical Science. By James Wm. Barlow.

We are capable of judging in matters of morals, origin of the faculty, Scripture enjoins its use, the appeal in case of differences of opinion, a misunderstanding corrected, sin by a finite being can not be an infinite offence, the relations of the offering of Christ, Creature responsibility, the necessarian theory, is God vindictive ? an illustration, are there few that are saved ? Francis' ingenuity in torture, a difficulty removed, importance of correct views, the horrors of the popular dogma not fully appreciated, a strong and just conclusion. pp. 57–79.

Preaching to Spirits in Prison. Biblical Notes and Queries. pp. 79–80.

No. 4. APRIL, 1871.

The Man of Sin. Anon.

Differing interpretations stated, and the Futurist exegesis thoroughly refuted, the man of sin identified in the Papacy. pp. 81–110.

Sheol. By Wm. L. Himes.

Appeal to Scripture usage, Underworld—what does it mean ? Is the interior of the globe inhabited ? SHEOL defined, Is "theological necessity" a proper rule of interpretation ? An examination of every passage in which the term occurs, the conclusion from the investigation, the definitions of scholars, conclusion. pp. 112–133.

Immanuel's Land. Poetry. pp. 133–134.

The Pre-Existence of Christ. By James H. Whitmore.

The question stated, John's testimony, Christ's direct assertions, Insufficiency of Socinian exegesis, Pauline Christology, testimony of the Old Testament. pp. 134–145.

The Two-Horned Beast. By Eld. John Couch.

Varieties of opinion, Reason for these differences, Search of inspired interpretation, The same symbol in the Old Testament, The leopard beast, The Greek Empire, Intermarriage of the Russian emperors with the Cæsars. The "image beast," The Holy Alliance, Conclusion.

The Nature of the Soul. By Andrew Armour.

Editorial.

Doubts concerning Religion, McCosh on Materialism, The Little Stone, Table of Contents.

error not literalism, the parable of the nobleman, Rev. 1 : 9, the PALINGENESIA and APOCATASTASIS, the glorious reality. pp. 105–116.

Stuart on Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.

Not a work for the times, the republishers unwise, Its force is against Origen s theory, It assumes the point now in dispute, Man made in the image of God, Stuart's admissions, the appeal from Stuart to Stuart, the light of nature, A challenge. pp. 117–125.

The popular Superstition. By Eld. O. R. Fassett.

What is a ghost ? the children's discussion, Christian superstition, the Church Hellenized, Scripture necrology, the witch at Endor, Eliphaz' vision, Angels not human spirits, Ghost-stories, Appeal to the Scriptures. pp. 126–147.

Life and Immortality only in Christ. Rainbow. pp. 148–150.

The Principle of Interpretation. By Henry Constable. pp. 150–151.

The Doom of the Unjust. By Henry Constable.

A review of Mr. Pridham, exposing several popular errors upon the subject indicated. pp. 151–162.

Editorial. pp. 163–164.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1871.

Ancient Jewish Knowledge of the Future State. By Edward Falconer Litton.

Their sources of information, the immortality dogma unknown to the Jews, the Law, Division of opinion, Influence of Grecian philosophy, Life and immortality brought to light. pp. 1–9.

Satan's Estimate of Sin. (Sel.) pp. 9–15.

Is the Soul a Separate Entity ? By Jas. H. Whitmore.

The subject opened, Mr. Clark's position, the once-in-seven-years-change theory exploded, Intuitions of duality, an assumed absurdity, testimony of consciousness, relations of mind to the body, appeal to the Creator, the phenomena of death, various objections considered—their weakness exposed, Facts vs. Assertion, Qualities of matter not yet fully understood. pp. 15–42.

The Burial of Moses. Poetry. pp. 42–43.

The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life. By Rev. Wm. Leask.

Our right to question interpretations, God's honor involved, Scripture reveals a future life, it is not by nature, is connected with the resurrection, true progression, the glorious prospect. pp. 44–56.

The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment in its Relations to Ethical Science. By James Wm. Barlow.

We are capable of judging in matters of morals, origin of the faculty, Scripture enjoins its use, the appeal in case of differences of opinion, a misunderstanding corrected, sin by a finite being can not be an infinite offence, the relations of the offering of Christ, Creature responsibility, the necessarian theory, is God vindictive ? an illustration, are there few that are saved ? Francis' ingenuity in torture, a difficulty removed, importance of correct views, the horrors of the popular dogma not fully appreciated, a strong and just conclusion. pp. 57–79.

Preaching to Spirits in Prison. Biblical Notes and Queries. pp. 79–80.

No. 4. APRIL, 1871.

The Man of Sin. Anon.

Differing interpretations stated, and the Futurist exegesis thoroughly refuted, the man of sin identified in the Papacy. pp. 81–110.

Sheol. By Wm. L. Himes.

Appeal to Scripture usage, Underworld—what does it mean ? Is the interior of the globe inhabited ? SHEOL defined, Is "theological necessity" a proper rule of interpretation ? An examination of every passage in which the term occurs, the conclusion from the investigation, the definitions of scholars, conclusion. pp. 112–133.

Immanuel's Land. Poetry. pp. 133–134.

The Pre-Existence of Christ. By James H. Whitmore.

The question stated, John's testimony, Christ's direct assertions, Insufficiency of Socinian exegesis, Pauline Christology, testimony of the Old Testament. pp. 134–145.

The Two-Horned Beast. By Eld. John Couch.

Varieties of opinion, Reason for these differences, Search of inspired interpretation, The same symbol in the Old Testament, The leopard beast, The Greek Empire, Intermarriage of the Russian emperors with the Cæsars. The "image beast," The Holy Alliance, Conclusion.

The Nature of the Soul. By Andrew Armour.

Editorial.

Doubts concerning Religion, McCosh on Materialism, The Little Stone, Table of Contents.

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM L. HIMES.

If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain:....they also which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished.....But now is Christ risen from the dead. (1 Cor. 15: 17–20.)
Your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. (Col. 3: 3, 4.)
Looking for that blessed hope. (Tit 2: 13.)

BUCHANAN, MICHIGAN:
WESTERN ADVENT-CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.
1869.

UMI

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM L. HIMES.

If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain:....they also which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished.....But now is Christ risen from the dead. (1 Cor. 15: 17–20.)
Your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. (Col. 3: 3, 4.)
Looking for that blessed hope. (Tit 2: 13.)

BUCHANAN, MICHIGAN:
WESTERN ADVENT-CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.
1869.

UMI

"Voice of the West" Press: W. A. C. P. Association, Buchanan, Mich.

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—JULY, 1869.—NO. I.

AN APOLOGY.

During the summer of 1868, I received the following letter:

Dear Brother in Christ: We are strangers to each other. I am a Free Methodist preacher, stationed in Rochester, N. Y. I am in sympathy with earnest Christianity, and am striving to promote it. My attention has been turned, of late, toward some of the special planks in your theological platform. I am an honest inquirer after truth. But I cannot *leap* to conclusions. I want a rocky foundation on which to stand. I am committed to follow Jesus whithersoever he may lead me. I have been wonderfully saved from sectarian bigotry. I think more of God than of all the Churches combined. I am after truth—goodness—purity—salvation—eternal life! It occurred to me that you might help me by your own experience. I understand that you are one of the oldest Advent preachers. Also, that you only quite recently embraced the theory that the wicked will be exterminated. I will be very much obliged if you will answer a few queries:

1. Are you now fully settled that the wicked will be stricken out of existence?

2. If this is the true Scripture doctrine, why did you not embrace it sooner Perhaps you see the point of difficulty in my mind. If it took you years to reach a settled belief, does it not seem that there are at least *two sides* to the subject, with strong arguments and strong objections on either hand?

3. Can you harmonize your present views with the entire Bible? Do you not find real difficulties that you have to pass over without a solution?

4. It is evident that in *your* mind, at least, there were, for many years, formidable barriers in the way of adopting some of the views now common among the Advent people. How did you get through those difficulties? is the question that especially interests me. A full, explicit answer would be hailed with special gratitude. This letter is not designed for controversy or

"Voice of the West" Press: W. A. C. P. Association, Buchanan, Mich.

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—JULY, 1869.—NO. I.

AN APOLOGY.

During the summer of 1868, I received the following letter:

Dear Brother in Christ: We are strangers to each other. I am a Free Methodist preacher, stationed in Rochester, N. Y. I am in sympathy with earnest Christianity, and am striving to promote it. My attention has been turned, of late, toward some of the special planks in your theological platform. I am an honest inquirer after truth. But I cannot *leap* to conclusions. I want a rocky foundation on which to stand. I am committed to follow Jesus whithersoever he may lead me. I have been wonderfully saved from sectarian bigotry. I think more of God than of all the Churches combined. I am after truth—goodness—purity—salvation—eternal life! It occurred to me that you might help me by your own experience. I understand that you are one of the oldest Advent preachers. Also, that you only quite recently embraced the theory that the wicked will be exterminated. I will be very much obliged if you will answer a few queries:

1. Are you now fully settled that the wicked will be stricken out of existence?

2. If this is the true Scripture doctrine, why did you not embrace it sooner Perhaps you see the point of difficulty in my mind. If it took you years to reach a settled belief, does it not seem that there are at least *two sides* to the subject, with strong arguments and strong objections on either hand?

3. Can you harmonize your present views with the entire Bible? Do you not find real difficulties that you have to pass over without a solution?

4. It is evident that in *your* mind, at least, there were, for many years, formidable barriers in the way of adopting some of the views now common among the Advent people. How did you get through those difficulties? is the question that especially interests me. A full, explicit answer would be hailed with special gratitude. This letter is not designed for controversy or

speculation, but to bring out the light, and, if possible, help an anxious heart. *Does it look all clear and harmonious to you now?* Are you *sure* you are on the Bible platform? Please go over the ground, and meet my solicitudes as best you can.

A. A. PHELPS.

Rochester, N. Y., July 20, 1868.

To these queries I gave a private reply; but similar interrogations from strangers, and old fellow-laborers in the Advent cause, concerning my change of views upon this awful subject, seem to demand a more particular and public answer. This answer I have long intended to make, in a work that should give an extended view of the considerations which led me to make a re-examination of this question, and the arguments which revolutionized my opinions concerning it.

This work, of which this article was designed to form the opening chapter, has been written at intervals, during tours in different sections of the country, amid the perplexity of onerous cares and duties in other directions, but is now nearly completed, and may, I hope, be published soon.

I. To Eld. Phelps' first question, I reply: I am "fully settled" that the final doom of the ungodly is extinction of being.

And I may here remark, that the author of the above questions, formerly an elder in the Free Methodist connection, a Christian minister of rare spirit and worth, has himself now become "fully settled" on this question, and is thoroughly convinced that man is a mortal being, and that the doom of wicked men is, literally, "everlasting destruction."[1]

II. That the Christian Church and doctrine were early corrupted by the influence of converts made from the schoolmen, both Greeks and Latins, of the Platonic and other philosophies, is not a disputed point. But I also am sure, though as yet comparatively few admit it, that among these corruptions are to be numbered the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, a conscious intermediate state, and the everlasting suffering of the finally impenitent. The influence of the Platonic philosophy, and its spiritualizing system of Biblical interpretation, has been such that for centuries the above doctrines, though nowhere stated in plain terms in the Bible, and with only a few passages of Scripture apparently reading in their favor, while hundreds of passages in the plain letter of their language are decidedly against them, have been made a test of Orthodoxy.

[1] See his article, *Settled at Last*, in *Voice of the West* for April 13, 1869.

Now while I make no pretensions to the learning of the schools, I do confess that in the past I have had too much confidence in many of their teachings, which I followed for nearly forty years.

I made a profession of religion, and joined the Christian Church in New Bedford, Mass., in 1824. This body was at that time divided in sentiment in their views of the nature of man. Some held with Eld. Elias Smith, one of the founders of that denomination, who taught that man was a mortal being, and that the doom of the sinner was, to be destroyed forever.[1] Others, with Eld. Abner Jones, another prominent leader of that sect, held to the common view of the immortality of the soul and the eternal misery of the lost.

I was by some train of circumstances and associations, which I cannot now recall, much prejudiced against Eld. Smith's views, and embraced those of his opponents. So that my first impressions on this important subject favored the common theology.

In 1830 I was settled over the First Christian Church of Boston. As there was considerable affinity between the Christians and Unitarians of Boston and Cambridge, chiefly on account of the anti-Trinitarian views of the former, I was brought into fraternal relations with the last named body. I had the regard of all, but received special attentions from Drs. Channing and Gannett, and Prof. Henry Ware, jr., and others at Harvard University. As I was not an educated man, they afforded me many facilities for the prosecution of certain studies, which I could pursue in connection with my pastoral duties. By these associations I became more fully educated in the theory, and confirmed in the belief of the doctrines of the immortality of the soul.

In 1839 I sought and made the acquaintance of William Miller, and heard from him the argument for the personal return of Christ, and his reign on the earth in a renewed condition. He also taught the immortality of the soul, and the usual attendant doctrines of that dogma; so that while his arguments induced me to change my views of the nature of the Millennium and the divinity of Christ, I was still further confirmed in my erroneous opinions of the nature of man and the destiny of the lost.

In 1840 the subject of the mortality of man and the destruction of the wicked was introduced among the Adventists by the writ-

[1] In *The Herald of Gospel Liberty*, Vol. 3, No. 75, speaking of "thousands in the Western country," he said: "They also discard the *popular* and *pagan* doctrine of eternal misery; believing that the *end* of the wicked is *destruction*, according to the words of Solomon, 'As the whirlwind passeth, so is the wicked no more.'"

speculation, but to bring out the light, and, if possible, help an anxious heart. *Does it look all clear and harmonious to you now?* Are you *sure* you are on the Bible platform? Please go over the ground, and meet my solicitudes as best you can.

A. A. PHELPS.

Rochester, N. Y., July 20, 1868.

To these queries I gave a private reply; but similar interrogations from strangers, and old fellow-laborers in the Advent cause, concerning my change of views upon this awful subject, seem to demand a more particular and public answer. This answer I have long intended to make, in a work that should give an extended view of the considerations which led me to make a re-examination of this question, and the arguments which revolutionized my opinions concerning it.

This work, of which this article was designed to form the opening chapter, has been written at intervals, during tours in different sections of the country, amid the perplexity of onerous cares and duties in other directions, but is now nearly completed, and may, I hope, be published soon.

I. To Eld. Phelps' first question, I reply: I am "fully settled" that the final doom of the ungodly is extinction of being.

And I may here remark, that the author of the above questions, formerly an elder in the Free Methodist connection, a Christian minister of rare spirit and worth, has himself now become "fully settled" on this question, and is thoroughly convinced that man is a mortal being, and that the doom of wicked men is, literally, "everlasting destruction."[1]

II. That the Christian Church and doctrine were early corrupted by the influence of converts made from the schoolmen, both Greeks and Latins, of the Platonic and other philosophies, is not a disputed point. But I also am sure, though as yet comparatively few admit it, that among these corruptions are to be numbered the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, a conscious intermediate state, and the everlasting suffering of the finally impenitent. The influence of the Platonic philosophy, and its spiritualizing system of Biblical interpretation, has been such that for centuries the above doctrines, though nowhere stated in plain terms in the Bible, and with only a few passages of Scripture apparently reading in their favor, while hundreds of passages in the plain letter of their language are decidedly against them, have been made a test of Orthodoxy.

[1] See his article, *Settled at Last*, in *Voice of the West* for April 13, 1869.

Now while I make no pretensions to the learning of the schools, I do confess that in the past I have had too much confidence in many of their teachings, which I followed for nearly forty years.

I made a profession of religion, and joined the Christian Church in New Bedford, Mass., in 1824. This body was at that time divided in sentiment in their views of the nature of man. Some held with Eld. Elias Smith, one of the founders of that denomination, who taught that man was a mortal being, and that the doom of the sinner was, to be destroyed forever.[1] Others, with Eld. Abner Jones, another prominent leader of that sect, held to the common view of the immortality of the soul and the eternal misery of the lost.

I was by some train of circumstances and associations, which I cannot now recall, much prejudiced against Eld. Smith's views, and embraced those of his opponents. So that my first impressions on this important subject favored the common theology.

In 1830 I was settled over the First Christian Church of Boston. As there was considerable affinity between the Christians and Unitarians of Boston and Cambridge, chiefly on account of the anti-Trinitarian views of the former, I was brought into fraternal relations with the last named body. I had the regard of all, but received special attentions from Drs. Channing and Gannett, and Prof. Henry Ware, jr., and others at Harvard University. As I was not an educated man, they afforded me many facilities for the prosecution of certain studies, which I could pursue in connection with my pastoral duties. By these associations I became more fully educated in the theory, and confirmed in the belief of the doctrines of the immortality of the soul.

In 1839 I sought and made the acquaintance of William Miller, and heard from him the argument for the personal return of Christ, and his reign on the earth in a renewed condition. He also taught the immortality of the soul, and the usual attendant doctrines of that dogma; so that while his arguments induced me to change my views of the nature of the Millennium and the divinity of Christ, I was still further confirmed in my erroneous opinions of the nature of man and the destiny of the lost.

In 1840 the subject of the mortality of man and the destruction of the wicked was introduced among the Adventists by the writ-

[1] In *The Herald of Gospel Liberty*, Vol. 3, No. 75, speaking of "thousands in the Western country," he said: "They also discard the *popular* and *pagan* doctrine of eternal misery; believing that the *end* of the wicked is *destruction*, according to the words of Solomon, 'As the whirlwind passeth, so is the wicked no more.'"

ings of Henry Grew, one of the ablest of the many writers who have treated upon that question. The same views were put into a popular form by Eld. Geo. Storrs, in six sermons, which he published and scattered widely, with no little success in making converts to the views he then held. But they made no impression upon my mind. I had read long before the works of Elias Smith and Henry Grew, and being strongly entrenched in the popular theology, was not prepared to look with interest or favor on later productions; more especially as I felt the responsibility of a work which occupied my entire strength and attention, viz: to publish the news of the speedy coming of Christ and his kingdom.

Occupied as I was with the imminence of the Second Advent, these other views seemed to me to be a side issue, and of no special importance. Jesus was at hand, and it was in my estimation of more importance to prepare a people for his coming, than to enlighten them on these other questions. Whether men slept or were conscious in death, and were destroyed or suffered eternally for sin, were questions of minor importance to me. God would do right; and we should soon know all about it. My business was to proclaim the glorious coming and kingdom of Christ and prepare myself and others to meet the Judge.

How far these opinions and feelings were justifiable, in view of my early education, sympathies (or prejudices, if the reader pleases), and the pressing responsibilities of the time, I will not here discuss. Others shared them with me, and I held them without misgivings or doubt up to about the year 1860, when I was led to make a

RE-EXAMINATION OF THE SUBJECT.

I have said that up to 1860 I was not impressed with the importance of the so-called *Life and Death question* as a vital issue in Christian theology. It was, I think, in that year that I was led to commence an earnest re-examination of the subject, as the result of a deeply interesting conversation and discussion with Dr. O. R. Fassett, who was then residing in Westboro, Mass.

Our conversation turned on the eternal suffering of the wicked, and the consistency of its relations to the revealed attributes of God, particularly his love and his justice. Eld. Fassett argued that the Almighty could not consistently doom a frail, weak, though sinning, creature to eternal, indescribable anguish, without one ray of light or hope as to the future. He appealed to my

sympathies, declaring his belief that I could not, at heart, as a man or a Christian, seriously believe a dogma so horrifying. Previous to this, I had always taken the ground that human sympathy had nothing to do with the truth on this question, but his appeal now produced an impression I could not rid myself of. I felt that I was touched as never before, and that the subject demanded my most serious attention.

In pursuing the subject I found no relief from the arguments or considerations advanced by the advocates of eternal wo respecting the sympathies of the righteous. Take for example the sentiments uttered by Jonathan Edwards:

> "The woes of sinners in hell will not be a cause of grief to the saints in heaven—but of rejoicing. This rejoicing will be the fruit of an amiable disposition, and a perfect holiness, and conformity to Christ. At the judgment you may be ready to fly to some godly friend, but you will see them unconcerned for you, with joy ascending to meet the Lord, and not less joyful for the horror in which they see you. When THEY HEAR you GROAN and SIGH and GNASH YOUR TEETH, these things will not MOVE them at all to pity you. *After your godly parents shall have seen you lie in hell millions of years, or ages, in torment day and night, they will not begin to pity you then. They will praise God that his justice appears in the eternity of your misery.* The torments in hell will be immeasurably greater than being in a GLOWING OVEN, A BRICK KILN, OR FIERY FURNACE."

My soul sickened at such sentiments. It seemed to me that none but a monomaniac upon the subject could so write or believe: and I soon dismissed once and forever the Orthodox views on the question of sympathy with the lost.

I know that Landis, while ingeniously avoiding the real force of this question, attempts to cover his evasion of it by coarse denunciations of those who have examined the dogma of deathless agony, for the lost in the light of human sympathy, styling their reasoning "mawkish," "namby-pamby sentimentalism;" but we doubt if either he or any of his fellows in the Orthodox ministry of to-day dare give utterance in their pulpits to the sentiments quoted above from Edwards. The demands of human sympathy have undeniably greatly modified Orthodox doctrine. It is not now what it was even a few years since. Still in writing and preaching, this question of sympathy is evaded, or passed over in silence. But we cannot evade the fact, that if the lost are to lie in *gehenna* suffering eternally concentrating agony as long as God and his saints live, those saints, in order to hap-

UMI

ings of Henry Grew, one of the ablest of the many writers who have treated upon that question. The same views were put into a popular form by Eld. Geo. Storrs, in six sermons, which he published and scattered widely, with no little success in making converts to the views he then held. But they made no impression upon my mind. I had read long before the works of Elias Smith and Henry Grew, and being strongly entrenched in the popular theology, was not prepared to look with interest or favor on later productions; more especially as I felt the responsibility of a work which occupied my entire strength and attention, viz: to publish the news of the speedy coming of Christ and his kingdom.

Occupied as I was with the imminence of the Second Advent, these other views seemed to me to be a side issue, and of no special importance. Jesus was at hand, and it was in my estimation of more importance to prepare a people for his coming, than to enlighten them on these other questions. Whether men slept or were conscious in death, and were destroyed or suffered eternally for sin, were questions of minor importance to me. God would do right; and we should soon know all about it. My business was to proclaim the glorious coming and kingdom of Christ and prepare myself and others to meet the Judge.

How far these opinions and feelings were justifiable, in view of my early education, sympathies (or prejudices, if the reader pleases), and the pressing responsibilities of the time, I will not here discuss. Others shared them with me, and I held them without misgivings or doubt up to about the year 1860, when I was led to make a

RE-EXAMINATION OF THE SUBJECT.

I have said that up to 1860 I was not impressed with the importance of the so-called *Life and Death question* as a vital issue in Christian theology. It was, I think, in that year that I was led to commence an earnest re-examination of the subject, as the result of a deeply interesting conversation and discussion with Dr. O. R. Fassett, who was then residing in Westboro, Mass.

Our conversation turned on the eternal suffering of the wicked, and the consistency of its relations to the revealed attributes of God, particularly his love and his justice. Eld. Fassett argued that the Almighty could not consistently doom a frail, weak, though sinning, creature to eternal, indescribable anguish, without one ray of light or hope as to the future. He appealed to my

sympathies, declaring his belief that I could not, at heart, as a man or a Christian, seriously believe a dogma so horrifying. Previous to this, I had always taken the ground that human sympathy had nothing to do with the truth on this question, but his appeal now produced an impression I could not rid myself of. I felt that I was touched as never before, and that the subject demanded my most serious attention.

In pursuing the subject I found no relief from the arguments or considerations advanced by the advocates of eternal wo respecting the sympathies of the righteous. Take for example the sentiments uttered by Jonathan Edwards:

> "The woes of sinners in hell will not be a cause of grief to the saints in heaven—but of rejoicing. This rejoicing will be the fruit of an amiable disposition, and a perfect holiness, and conformity to Christ. At the judgment you may be ready to fly to some godly friend, but you will see them unconcerned for you, with joy ascending to meet the Lord, and not less joyful for the horror in which they see you. When THEY HEAR you GROAN and SIGH and GNASH YOUR TEETH, these things will not MOVE them at all to pity you. *After your godly parents shall have seen you lie in hell millions of years, or ages, in torment day and night, they will not begin to pity you then. They will praise God that his justice appears in the eternity of your misery.* The torments in hell will be immeasurably greater than being in a GLOWING OVEN, A BRICK KILN, OR FIERY FURNACE."

My soul sickened at such sentiments. It seemed to me that none but a monomaniac upon the subject could so write or believe: and I soon dismissed once and forever the Orthodox views on the question of sympathy with the lost.

I know that Landis, while ingeniously avoiding the real force of this question, attempts to cover his evasion of it by coarse denunciations of those who have examined the dogma of deathless agony, for the lost in the light of human sympathy, styling their reasoning "mawkish," "namby-pamby sentimentalism;" but we doubt if either he or any of his fellows in the Orthodox ministry of to-day dare give utterance in their pulpits to the sentiments quoted above from Edwards. The demands of human sympathy have undeniably greatly modified Orthodox doctrine. It is not now what it was even a few years since. Still in writing and preaching, this question of sympathy is evaded, or passed over in silence. But we cannot evade the fact, that if the lost are to lie in *gehenna* suffering eternally concentrating agony as long as God and his saints live, those saints, in order to hap-

UMI

piness, must become so utterly callous to all claims for pity as to be absolutely unmoved by the deathless pangs of their former companions, children, friends, and fellow-beings, though fully conscious of what they are enduring, and also aware that the passage of ages of sufferings so far from bringing them nearer a termination, must in the very nature of the case add intensity to their woe.

Scholastic theology, dealing with dogmas and "immortal souls" as mere abstractions, may calmly reason of eternal woe; but when we examine the subject in the light of the fact that we, our families, friends, and fellow men, as beings of sensitive natures, keenly alive to mental and physical suffering, are exposed to such a peril as the dogma of eternal misery asserts, one may indeed attempt to receive, or imagine it as true; but as Bp. Newton has well said, "seriously believe it you cannot!" It would be a perversion of human nature to do so, to say nothing of the spirit of Christianity.

Our Heavenly Father has taught us by both precept and example to be "kind to the unthankful and the unholy" in this life, and our hearts are easily roused by the sufferings of our common humanity. But, we are told, in the world to come we shall behold countless myriads of the lost in the torments of hell, as "in an unfathomable sea of liquid fire, where the wicked must drink in everlasting torture,"[1] and not feel one sympathetic emotion, or our happiness be for a moment marred by the terrible scene!

I know that our sympathies, of themselves, cannot, and should not, settle this question: yet they furnish a presumptive argument against the doctrine of deathless woe much stronger than many of the arguments from reason, so-called, which Immaterialists offer for the immortality of the soul: for instance, those drawn from the powers of the mind, its desires, etc.

But it is said, that our sympathy has nothing to do with the justice of God. Allowing the claim to be a just one, for the sake of the argument, the question would still arise, "What is *justice* in the case of the lost?" In my meditations, my mind would recall the horrid descriptions I had heard and read of the future of the lost. I seemed to be placed among them, and beheld in imagination untold millions writhing in unutterable anguish, eternity before them, with no hope of release, but filled with a

[1] Benson.

horrible despair at the prospect of ever-increasing, as well as ever-during suffering—shipwrecked, and drifting upon a shoreless sea of woe!

Such reflections continually forced themselves upon me. I could not divest myself of them, as I had put aside the consideration of the subject in other days, by the thought that the question was a side-issue, and that "God would do right" in any case; but I felt that I must satisfy myself that there was *no mistake* in that interpretation of Scripture whose issue was now so revolting to my whole nature. And thus I was led to, I believe, a candid and thorough re-examination of the entire subject, as presented in the word of God, which I recognized as my only rule of faith in regard to this, or any other doctrine. I would bow to the sacred word; but I must re-examine its utterances on the doom awaiting, perhaps, the larger portion of mankind.

Immediately other influences began to affect me. As a public teacher I had long stood opposed to the doctrine of the sleep of the dead and destruction of the wicked, and I must now meet a large circle of companions and friends, endeared by many ties in the past, who had received the views I now questioned from both my lips and pen; who looked to me for a sturdy defense of a doctrine the truth of which I was fairly beginning to doubt. They had learned of me, taken my counsel in upholding the Orthodox views and opposing the "annihilationists," as they were, and are, popularly called. I must be prepared to have my motives impugned, and my words, spoken and written before my mind was assailed by doubts, or convicted of my error, "cast in my teeth," while many who had been my friends would walk with me no more. I had to count the cost. I must pass through a severe conflict in the midst of onerous labors in another department of a great cause. But my mind was made up. I was determined to know for myself if there was not a more consistent and harmonious interpretation of the word of God, and to stand by the convictions of truth which should result from my investigations at whatever cost.

III. As to the inquiry concerning present difficulties, I find no perplexity in my own mind in harmonizing the Scripture testimony concerning the penalty of sin. To say that I am fully satisfied of the exact meaning of every passage of Scripture involved in the question at issue would perhaps seem like arrogating too much to myself: but I have learned, at least, not to give to any one pas-

UMI

piness, must become so utterly callous to all claims for pity as to be absolutely unmoved by the deathless pangs of their former companions, children, friends, and fellow-beings, though fully conscious of what they are enduring, and also aware that the passage of ages of sufferings so far from bringing them nearer a termination, must in the very nature of the case add intensity to their woe.

Scholastic theology, dealing with dogmas and "immortal souls" as mere abstractions, may calmly reason of eternal woe; but when we examine the subject in the light of the fact that we, our families, friends, and fellow men, as beings of sensitive natures, keenly alive to mental and physical suffering, are exposed to such a peril as the dogma of eternal misery asserts, one may indeed attempt to receive, or imagine it as true; but as Bp. Newton has well said, "seriously believe it you cannot!" It would be a perversion of human nature to do so, to say nothing of the spirit of Christianity.

Our Heavenly Father has taught us by both precept and example to be "kind to the unthankful and the unholy" in this life, and our hearts are easily roused by the sufferings of our common humanity. But, we are told, in the world to come we shall behold countless myriads of the lost in the torments of hell, as "in an unfathomable sea of liquid fire, where the wicked must drink in everlasting torture,"[1] and not feel one sympathetic emotion, or our happiness be for a moment marred by the terrible scene!

I know that our sympathies, of themselves, cannot, and should not, settle this question: yet they furnish a presumptive argument against the doctrine of deathless woe much stronger than many of the arguments from reason, so-called, which Immaterialists offer for the immortality of the soul: for instance, those drawn from the powers of the mind, its desires, etc.

But it is said, that our sympathy has nothing to do with the justice of God. Allowing the claim to be a just one, for the sake of the argument, the question would still arise, "What is *justice* in the case of the lost?" In my meditations, my mind would recall the horrid descriptions I had heard and read of the future of the lost. I seemed to be placed among them, and beheld in imagination untold millions writhing in unutterable anguish, eternity before them, with no hope of release, but filled with a

[1] Benson.

horrible despair at the prospect of ever-increasing, as well as ever-during suffering—shipwrecked, and drifting upon a shoreless sea of woe!

Such reflections continually forced themselves upon me. I could not divest myself of them, as I had put aside the consideration of the subject in other days, by the thought that the question was a side-issue, and that "God would do right" in any case; but I felt that I must satisfy myself that there was *no mistake* in that interpretation of Scripture whose issue was now so revolting to my whole nature. And thus I was led to, I believe, a candid and thorough re-examination of the entire subject, as presented in the word of God, which I recognized as my only rule of faith in regard to this, or any other doctrine. I would bow to the sacred word; but I must re-examine its utterances on the doom awaiting, perhaps, the larger portion of mankind.

Immediately other influences began to affect me. As a public teacher I had long stood opposed to the doctrine of the sleep of the dead and destruction of the wicked, and I must now meet a large circle of companions and friends, endeared by many ties in the past, who had received the views I now questioned from both my lips and pen; who looked to me for a sturdy defense of a doctrine the truth of which I was fairly beginning to doubt. They had learned of me, taken my counsel in upholding the Orthodox views and opposing the "annihilationists," as they were, and are, popularly called. I must be prepared to have my motives impugned, and my words, spoken and written before my mind was assailed by doubts, or convicted of my error, "cast in my teeth," while many who had been my friends would walk with me no more. I had to count the cost. I must pass through a severe conflict in the midst of onerous labors in another department of a great cause. But my mind was made up. I was determined to know for myself if there was not a more consistent and harmonious interpretation of the word of God, and to stand by the convictions of truth which should result from my investigations at whatever cost.

III. As to the inquiry concerning present difficulties, I find no perplexity in my own mind in harmonizing the Scripture testimony concerning the penalty of sin. To say that I am fully satisfied of the exact meaning of every passage of Scripture involved in the question at issue would perhaps seem like arrogating too much to myself: but I have learned, at least, not to give to any one pas-

UMI

sage standing by itself a gloss that shall contradict the general tenor of Scripture. And every fresh examination of any branch of this great question of *life and death eternal* strengthens my convictions that eternal life is "the gift of God," while "the wages of sin is death."

IV. In answer to the fourth query advanced by my interlocutor, I would say, there *were* "formidable barriers" in the way of my reception of this doctrine. Chief among these, and beside the considerations already named, was *the authority of the Christian fathers.*

I took it for granted, first of all, that the early fathers of the Church were to be relied upon in their expositions of apostolic teaching. Associated with the apostles or their immediate disciples, I reasoned that they must have understood the construction which the personal disciples of Jesus Christ gave to his words concerning the awful doom of the finally impenitent. It was long a question how many of the fathers of the second century and onward could advance such sentiments as they did concerning the immortality of the soul and future punishment, unless they had received them from the apostles, or apostolic converts. But the spell (and it is a spell that still holds many in bondage to a dreadful theology) was at last broken by the Savior's own teaching: "Call *no man* father upon earth," he said to his Church. And this destroys all claims to authority in matters of faith and doctrine of the writings of uninspired men, even though they lived near or in the apostles' days.

Besides this, on examination I soon saw the defectiveness of their teachings on other questions, and the additions made by them to the testimony of the Scriptures on various points of doctrine. Take for instance the intermediate state, and the use of the word *hades*—the grave, or rather the general state of the dead. Most of the fathers adopted the heathen view of *hades*, in brief, as follows: *Hades* was located in the deep—under, or in the bowels of, the earth. It was divided into two apartments, *Elysium*—the Fathers' Paradise—and *Tartarus*. Here were gathered the shades, or ghosts, or souls of the dead, awaiting the resurrection: the righteous "comforted," while the wicked were "tormented" in the flames of tartarus.[1]

But neither Christ nor his apostles ever taught such doctrine.

[1] It is to be observed that if the fathers are authority for our faith in the matter of a conscious intermediate state, they are equally so on the torments of souls by *literal* fire in *hades*—which is now almost universally denied by leading Orthodox teachers.

It is simply a heathen fable engrafted upon the pure teachings of the New Testament. True, a few passages are perverted to sustain this fabulous theory; and the perverted sense of these passages is made a standard by which the entire word is interpreted, and made to mean in some hundreds of instances precisely the opposite of what it says.

I know these are, as they stand here, mere assertions; but they are assertions, I am confident, which cannot be successfully controverted. The teachings of the fathers concerning the intermediate state, or any other point, have no claim upon our faith except as they harmonize with the oracles of God: and of their meaning we are, in most respects, in this day, probably even better qualified to judge than the fathers were.

Here I pause, having carried out, so far as my limits would admit, the design of this article. I did not intend to consider in it the arguments and reasons for my present faith, but, rather, to give my *experience* in reaching the conclusions in which my mind is now settled. The arguments which have forced me as an honest man and a Christian to take a decided stand, and exert a vigorous opposition against the views I once held, will be forthcoming, either in these pages, or elsewhere.

TRUTH AND LOVE—LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN.

I should not have troubled you with another letter, but for the avowal with which you conclude, that you feel bound to withdraw from Christian intercourse with any who "cause to err;" *i. e.*, who differ from you in any religious opinion, and venture to express their opinion; including of course all Baptists, Arminians, anti-Millennarians, and others, whom you must necessarily consider amongst those who "cause to err." This spirit, or principle, if you prefer it, has been the bane of the Church in all ages; it was the life and soul of the Inquisition, it is the essential virus of the worst kind of schism, and is that which enables the world to say, "See how these Christians hate one another!"

In this question of eternal suffering you have not even the excuse of its being a matter of *faith;* it is simply a matter of *opinion*. I do not say merely of *interpretation*, because a matter of faith, such as the deity of Christ or the Atonement, may de-

sage standing by itself a gloss that shall contradict the general tenor of Scripture. And every fresh examination of any branch of this great question of *life and death eternal* strengthens my convictions that eternal life is "the gift of God," while "the wages of sin is death."

IV. In answer to the fourth query advanced by my interlocutor, I would say, there *were* "formidable barriers" in the way of my reception of this doctrine. Chief among these, and beside the considerations already named, was *the authority of the Christian fathers.*

I took it for granted, first of all, that the early fathers of the Church were to be relied upon in their expositions of apostolic teaching. Associated with the apostles or their immediate disciples, I reasoned that they must have understood the construction which the personal disciples of Jesus Christ gave to his words concerning the awful doom of the finally impenitent. It was long a question how many of the fathers of the second century and onward could advance such sentiments as they did concerning the immortality of the soul and future punishment, unless they had received them from the apostles, or apostolic converts. But the spell (and it is a spell that still holds many in bondage to a dreadful theology) was at last broken by the Savior's own teaching: "Call *no man* father upon earth," he said to his Church. And this destroys all claims to authority in matters of faith and doctrine of the writings of uninspired men, even though they lived near or in the apostles' days.

Besides this, on examination I soon saw the defectiveness of their teachings on other questions, and the additions made by them to the testimony of the Scriptures on various points of doctrine. Take for instance the intermediate state, and the use of the word *hades*—the grave, or rather the general state of the dead. Most of the fathers adopted the heathen view of *hades*, in brief, as follows: *Hades* was located in the deep—under, or in the bowels of, the earth. It was divided into two apartments, *Elysium*—the Fathers' Paradise—and *Tartarus*. Here were gathered the shades, or ghosts, or souls of the dead, awaiting the resurrection: the righteous "comforted," while the wicked were "tormented" in the flames of tartarus.[1]

But neither Christ nor his apostles ever taught such doctrine.

[1] It is to be observed that if the fathers are authority for our faith in the matter of a conscious intermediate state, they are equally so on the torments of souls by *literal* fire in *hades*—which is now almost universally denied by leading Orthodox teachers.

It is simply a heathen fable engrafted upon the pure teachings of the New Testament. True, a few passages are perverted to sustain this fabulous theory; and the perverted sense of these passages is made a standard by which the entire word is interpreted, and made to mean in some hundreds of instances precisely the opposite of what it says.

I know these are, as they stand here, mere assertions; but they are assertions, I am confident, which cannot be successfully controverted. The teachings of the fathers concerning the intermediate state, or any other point, have no claim upon our faith except as they harmonize with the oracles of God: and of their meaning we are, in most respects, in this day, probably even better qualified to judge than the fathers were.

Here I pause, having carried out, so far as my limits would admit, the design of this article. I did not intend to consider in it the arguments and reasons for my present faith, but, rather, to give my *experience* in reaching the conclusions in which my mind is now settled. The arguments which have forced me as an honest man and a Christian to take a decided stand, and exert a vigorous opposition against the views I once held, will be forthcoming, either in these pages, or elsewhere.

TRUTH AND LOVE—LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN.

I should not have troubled you with another letter, but for the avowal with which you conclude, that you feel bound to withdraw from Christian intercourse with any who "cause to err;" *i. e.*, who differ from you in any religious opinion, and venture to express their opinion; including of course all Baptists, Arminians, anti-Millennarians, and others, whom you must necessarily consider amongst those who "cause to err." This spirit, or principle, if you prefer it, has been the bane of the Church in all ages; it was the life and soul of the Inquisition, it is the essential virus of the worst kind of schism, and is that which enables the world to say, "See how these Christians hate one another!"

In this question of eternal suffering you have not even the excuse of its being a matter of *faith;* it is simply a matter of *opinion*. I do not say merely of *interpretation*, because a matter of faith, such as the deity of Christ or the Atonement, may de-

pend on interpretation. But this doctrine, however important it may be in its practical bearings, and therefore however worthy of earnest discussion, is purely a matter of opinion.

I might have some excuse for elevating it into a matter of faith; because my enjoyment in looking forward to eternity depends in great measure on the assurance that God will be "*all in all*," that sin and misery will come to an end; and that at length "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain."

I can rejoice even now, notwithstanding the existence of present evil, "in hope of the glory of God;" in the prospect not merely of being myself delivered from the power of evil, but of forming part of God's glorious universe, when evil has been banished from it forever.

I should be sorry to be *able* to rejoice in the prospect of an eternity throughout which the wailings of despair would be continually ringing in my ears, and the writhings of agony be ever before my eyes; and equally sorry to think that I could ever sink to such an unutterable depth of selfishness as to be able to spend an eternity of happiness in forgetfulness of the fact that such things were going on, even though they were put far away out of sight and out of sound.

Furthermore, my hope of immortality depends upon the plain, natural meaning of those innumerable texts which you are obliged to rationalize upon, and interpret in a non-natural sense, in order to maintain the traditional philosophy about man's inherent immortality.

But *you* have no pretext for it whatever. Neither your faith nor your hope can in the slightest degree depend upon your interpretation of those passages being correct. Your hope centres in the salvation which Christ offers from sin and all its consequences. What those consequences will ultimately be to such as are not saved is a matter of opinion, and cannot possibly, in *your* view of it, touch the foundation at all. The eternal life, which we have in him, is precisely the same thing, whatever be the alternative to those who refuse it. So, too, are the means by which he obtained it for us, and communicates it to us.

If indeed we believed your view to be taught in Scripture, and still denied its truth, the case would be different; for we should be shaking the foundation of *all* faith. But you know that it is not so. You may think that our judgment is biased by our feelings, as we may think that yours is biased by traditional opinion and party discipline. But when Christians of approved character and undoubted credibility on both sides solemnly declare their conviction that the view they hold is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture as a whole, then for either party to break fellowship with the other on such a matter as this, because they refuse to do violence to their own convictions, and to accept the dictum of those who take another view, is, in the last degree, unchristian in principle, and disastrous in its effects upon the Church and the world. "Whereto we have already attained let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing, and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you."

That the difference of opinion is a very serious and important one, as bearing upon the success of the Gospel, from a human point of view, I not only admit, but strenuously maintain. I believe that your doctrine is the fruitful parent both of infidelity and of indifference; that it weakens the Gospel message, and in a variety of ways does incalculable mischief. You, on the other hand, think that my doctrine will make sinners less anxious to be converted, because less afraid of the ultimate consequences of sin; that the state of mind, which Paul pronounced to be the natural consequence of disbelieving in any future state either of happiness or misery, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," will also be produced, if men are told that the result of such conduct will merely be the loss of eternal happiness, and everlasting destruction soul and body in hell.

No doubt this difference of opinion, like *every* difference in a greater or less degree, must interpose *some* difficulty in our working together, and detract *somewhat* from the pleasure of mutual intercourse. But to refuse to hold communion with one another, to denounce one another, or to change countenance toward one another on that account would be a grievous sin—a sin of ignorance perhaps, but still a sin.

Do not those who are looking for the Lord's speedy coming believe that they who expect the world to be converted by missionary agency "cause to err," and weaken the force of the cry, "Prepare to meet thy God?" And on the other hand, do not those who believe that expectation to be Scriptural, consider that you and other Millenarians "cause to err?" Do they not believe that you will probably be the cause of many heathens spending an eternity in torment, by damping the missionary zeal of

UMI

pend on interpretation. But this doctrine, however important it may be in its practical bearings, and therefore however worthy of earnest discussion, is purely a matter of opinion.

I might have some excuse for elevating it into a matter of faith; because my enjoyment in looking forward to eternity depends in great measure on the assurance that God will be "*all in all*," that sin and misery will come to an end; and that at length "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain."

I can rejoice even now, notwithstanding the existence of present evil, "in hope of the glory of God;" in the prospect not merely of being myself delivered from the power of evil, but of forming part of God's glorious universe, when evil has been banished from it forever.

I should be sorry to be *able* to rejoice in the prospect of an eternity throughout which the wailings of despair would be continually ringing in my ears, and the writhings of agony be ever before my eyes; and equally sorry to think that I could ever sink to such an unutterable depth of selfishness as to be able to spend an eternity of happiness in forgetfulness of the fact that such things were going on, even though they were put far away out of sight and out of sound.

Furthermore, my hope of immortality depends upon the plain, natural meaning of those innumerable texts which you are obliged to rationalize upon, and interpret in a non-natural sense, in order to maintain the traditional philosophy about man's inherent immortality.

But *you* have no pretext for it whatever. Neither your faith nor your hope can in the slightest degree depend upon your interpretation of those passages being correct. Your hope centres in the salvation which Christ offers from sin and all its consequences. What those consequences will ultimately be to such as are not saved is a matter of opinion, and cannot possibly, in *your* view of it, touch the foundation at all. The eternal life, which we have in him, is precisely the same thing, whatever be the alternative to those who refuse it. So, too, are the means by which he obtained it for us, and communicates it to us.

If indeed we believed your view to be taught in Scripture, and still denied its truth, the case would be different; for we should be shaking the foundation of *all* faith. But you know that it is not so. You may think that our judgment is biased by our feelings, as we may think that yours is biased by traditional opinion and party discipline. But when Christians of approved character and undoubted credibility on both sides solemnly declare their conviction that the view they hold is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture as a whole, then for either party to break fellowship with the other on such a matter as this, because they refuse to do violence to their own convictions, and to accept the dictum of those who take another view, is, in the last degree, unchristian in principle, and disastrous in its effects upon the Church and the world. "Whereto we have already attained let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing, and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you."

That the difference of opinion is a very serious and important one, as bearing upon the success of the Gospel, from a human point of view, I not only admit, but strenuously maintain. I believe that your doctrine is the fruitful parent both of infidelity and of indifference; that it weakens the Gospel message, and in a variety of ways does incalculable mischief. You, on the other hand, think that my doctrine will make sinners less anxious to be converted, because less afraid of the ultimate consequences of sin; that the state of mind, which Paul pronounced to be the natural consequence of disbelieving in any future state either of happiness or misery, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," will also be produced, if men are told that the result of such conduct will merely be the loss of eternal happiness, and everlasting destruction soul and body in hell.

No doubt this difference of opinion, like *every* difference in a greater or less degree, must interpose *some* difficulty in our working together, and detract *somewhat* from the pleasure of mutual intercourse. But to refuse to hold communion with one another, to denounce one another, or to change countenance toward one another on that account would be a grievous sin—a sin of ignorance perhaps, but still a sin.

Do not those who are looking for the Lord's speedy coming believe that they who expect the world to be converted by missionary agency "cause to err," and weaken the force of the cry, "Prepare to meet thy God?" And on the other hand, do not those who believe that expectation to be Scriptural, consider that you and other Millenarians "cause to err?" Do they not believe that you will probably be the cause of many heathens spending an eternity in torment, by damping the missionary zeal of

UMI

those whose enthusiasm would have been kindled at the prospect of converting the world? Both sides are not only at liberty, but absolutely bound, according to the strength of their convictions, to endeavor to spread their own opinion. But are they to excommunicate one another, or look coldly upon one another, on account of this difference? Is it to embitter their mutual intercourse, or to debar them from all intercourse? Is one to call the other heretic, infidel, and so forth, because he "perverts" or "corrupts" what appears to his opponent's eyes so "plainly revealed," so "explicitly declared" in Scripture? Alas for our Master's seamless robe! Alas for the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace! How long, O Lord, how long?

CHRISTIANITY VS. CHURCHIANITY.

We are living in an age of shams and counterfeits. Satan seems to have abandoned the hope of crushing out the Christian Church by a process of undisguised hostility, and now seeks to destroy her efficiency by stealthily draining off her vitality, and robbing her of every supernatural element. He "transforms himself into an angel of light," and often assumes to be the special friend and guardian of the Church. Craftily he infuses his deadly virus and inculcates his plausible philosophy, until the moral perception is obscured, the conscience is distorted, and policy runs nearly the whole ecclesiastical machinery. Thus a popularized religion—which costs nothing and is worth nothing—is readily accepted, while the old religion of the cross is utterly discarded. The consequence is, that there is *religion* enough, and *Churchianity* enough, but *a great famine of real Christianity*. We meet with thousands all over the land who, if catechised in regard to their spiritual condition, reply with much self-assurance that they are members of such a Church. They assume that the Church is an ark of safety; and, once ensconced within her enclosures, all further anxiety ends. Let us try to unmask this dreadful delusion of the devil.

There is a difference, we may premise, between the *real* and the *nominal* Church of Christ. The former is composed of all true Christians. Its boundaries are therefore invisible, as no man can tell exactly where to draw the lines. The latter is composed of

those who assume the Christian name and practice the ordinances of God's house. It is commonly called the *visible* Church, because its boundary lines are known. The epithet may apply to a single local society of a given denomination, or to the aggregate of local societies of all denominations. We use the term, in this paper, to designate the outward or visible Church.

I. *Christ and the Church are not identical.* There may be ten thousand Churches, but there is only *one Christ*. Nor can *all* those Churches supply the place of our *one, blessed, all-sufficient Savior*. A man may be saved without the Church, but he cannot be saved without Christ. A man may be in the Church and *not* be saved; but he cannot be in *Christ* without salvation. *Sinners* sometimes become members of the Church; but only *saints* are members of Christ. A person may live in the Church for years, with the old heart of carnality and selfishness; but "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." Multitudes who are faithful to Church ordinances will land in perdition; but none who are faithful to Christ can possibly be lost. The requirements of the Church are often wrong and ruinous; but the claims of Christ are always reasonable and right. The Church may become a sink of pollution; but Christ is ever the perfection of purity. The Church may be rent with divisions; but Jesus Christ is not divided. The Church may become terribly entangled in mysticism and error; but Christ is always the embodiment of light and truth. The Church may change her name and her nature; but Christ is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." The Church may be a good crutch to walk with, but she is a poor Christ to trust in for salvation and eternal life.

II. *Christian worship and Church worship are not identical.* Vast multitudes cling to some Church establishment as a drowning man would cling to a life-boat. They bow obsequiously to her priestly and official mandates, and imagine that the blind servility which they render to the Church will be accounted acceptable service offered to Christ. If we do not misinterpret the tendency of the times, *there never was greater danger of making this fatal mistake than now*. Ritualism is rife. The simplicity of the gospel is lost in the imposing forms and glittering accompaniments of modern churchism. Splendid church edifices attract the eye. Splendid music charms the ear. Splendid prayers are addressed to the congregation. Splendid sermons please the fancy, and leave deluded sinners to slumber on.

UMI

those whose enthusiasm would have been kindled at the prospect of converting the world? Both sides are not only at liberty, but absolutely bound, according to the strength of their convictions, to endeavor to spread their own opinion. But are they to excommunicate one another, or look coldly upon one another, on account of this difference? Is it to embitter their mutual intercourse, or to debar them from all intercourse? Is one to call the other heretic, infidel, and so forth, because he "perverts" or "corrupts" what appears to his opponent's eyes so "plainly revealed," so "explicitly declared" in Scripture? Alas for our Master's seamless robe! Alas for the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace! How long, O Lord, how long?

CHRISTIANITY VS. CHURCHIANITY.

We are living in an age of shams and counterfeits. Satan seems to have abandoned the hope of crushing out the Christian Church by a process of undisguised hostility, and now seeks to destroy her efficiency by stealthily draining off her vitality, and robbing her of every supernatural element. He "transforms himself into an angel of light," and often assumes to be the special friend and guardian of the Church. Craftily he infuses his deadly virus and inculcates his plausible philosophy, until the moral perception is obscured, the conscience is distorted, and policy runs nearly the whole ecclesiastical machinery. Thus a popularized religion—which costs nothing and is worth nothing—is readily accepted, while the old religion of the cross is utterly discarded. The consequence is, that there is *religion* enough, and *Churchianity* enough, but *a great famine of real Christianity*. We meet with thousands all over the land who, if catechised in regard to their spiritual condition, reply with much self-assurance that they are members of such a Church. They assume that the Church is an ark of safety; and, once ensconced within her enclosures, all further anxiety ends. Let us try to unmask this dreadful delusion of the devil.

There is a difference, we may premise, between the *real* and the *nominal* Church of Christ. The former is composed of all true Christians. Its boundaries are therefore invisible, as no man can tell exactly where to draw the lines. The latter is composed of

those who assume the Christian name and practice the ordinances of God's house. It is commonly called the *visible* Church, because its boundary lines are known. The epithet may apply to a single local society of a given denomination, or to the aggregate of local societies of all denominations. We use the term, in this paper, to designate the outward or visible Church.

I. *Christ and the Church are not identical.* There may be ten thousand Churches, but there is only *one Christ*. Nor can *all* those Churches supply the place of our *one, blessed, all-sufficient Savior*. A man may be saved without the Church, but he cannot be saved without Christ. A man may be in the Church and *not* be saved; but he cannot be in *Christ* without salvation. *Sinners* sometimes become members of the Church; but only *saints* are members of Christ. A person may live in the Church for years, with the old heart of carnality and selfishness; but "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." Multitudes who are faithful to Church ordinances will land in perdition; but none who are faithful to Christ can possibly be lost. The requirements of the Church are often wrong and ruinous; but the claims of Christ are always reasonable and right. The Church may become a sink of pollution; but Christ is ever the perfection of purity. The Church may be rent with divisions; but Jesus Christ is not divided. The Church may become terribly entangled in mysticism and error; but Christ is always the embodiment of light and truth. The Church may change her name and her nature; but Christ is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." The Church may be a good crutch to walk with, but she is a poor Christ to trust in for salvation and eternal life.

II. *Christian worship and Church worship are not identical.* Vast multitudes cling to some Church establishment as a drowning man would cling to a life-boat. They bow obsequiously to her priestly and official mandates, and imagine that the blind servility which they render to the Church will be accounted acceptable service offered to Christ. If we do not misinterpret the tendency of the times, *there never was greater danger of making this fatal mistake than now*. Ritualism is rife. The simplicity of the gospel is lost in the imposing forms and glittering accompaniments of modern churchism. Splendid church edifices attract the eye. Splendid music charms the ear. Splendid prayers are addressed to the congregation. Splendid sermons please the fancy, and leave deluded sinners to slumber on.

UMI

Church rivalry has achieved a glorious success, if success consists in gorgeous temples, tall steeples, loud-sounding bells, thundering organs, ostentatious dressing, theatrical singing, pointless praying, rhetorical preaching, careless hearing, and unscriptural practicing!

Much of the current worship is done by proxy. Lazy religionists surrender their sacred rights to others. They take it for granted that the preacher is on the right track, and readily swallow whatever may be doled out from the pulpit, without using their own brains in searching for the hidden treasures of truth. Thus religious ideas are transmitted from generation to generation, until tradition exerts a more powerful influence than the Bible in molding the sentiments of men. There comes to be a fashionable *faith*, as well as a fashionable dress. To embrace a certain stereotyped circle of doctrinal views entitles a man to the claim of "orthodoxy;" but let him not venture one step out of the beaten track, if he would not be denounced as a deluded heretic! But few have the moral courage to question the decisions of the Church, much less to discard what she has labeled as "orthodox." The verdict of a few leading denominations has thus grown up into a threatening *tyranny*; and the multitude cannot think of stemming the mighty tide. So they bow down in their narrow enslavement and worship this curiously-fashioned but pious-looking idol—*the Church!* Since all idolatry is an abomination to God, we have no more right to worship a *church* than we have to worship a *golden calf!* We rob the Lord of his rightful honor, and ourselves of the highest bliss of Christianity, by looking to the Church too much, and "looking unto Jesus" too little. What can be done to deal a staggering blow to this cruel church-worship of the day, and at the same time give us more exalted and ravishing views of Jesus Christ? There is a grand failure to carry out the ultimate design, when the appliances of the gospel result only in the production of *Churchianity*. Our perception, our prayers, our faith, and our adoration must overleap the narrow precincts of the outward Church, and rise up to the eternal throne! "*Worship God!*"

III. *Christian fellowship and Church fellowship are not identical.* The followers of Christ are called upon to "love one another with a pure heart fervently." Indeed, this is one of the Scriptural tests of discipleship. "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." All Christians constitute one family, and *love* is the golden tie designed to

bind their hearts together around the common cross. But love is a tender plant that needs to be reared with a gentle hand. Hence the many exhortations of Scripture to "consider one another"—to "be kindly affectioned one to another"—to esteem others better than ourselves—to "bear one another's burdens"—to exercise a forgiving spirit—to "let brotherly love continue"—to "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." All such injunctions point out the danger of alienated feelings and poisoned affections, and show the importance of making a special effort to promote Christian unity and love. How disastrous are the results of not regarding these gospel precepts! Trivial differences of opinion are considered a sufficient ground for dividing the religious world into a thousand rival sects. Thus the general Church presents the strange spectacle of a thousand hostile armies, moving about with drawn swords and bristling bayonets, taking advantage of every weak point, and expending far more ammunition in firing into each other's ranks than they do in battering down the bulwarks of sin and Satan. This general jargon is by no means adapted to make a deep and favorable impression upon the hearts of sinners, but is especially calculated to convert the world to infidelity, and forestall the triumphs of the cross.

Most of the Churches have erected a false standard of piety, and made unauthorized tests of membership. *Churchianity* insists upon similarity of *opinions;* while *Christianity* makes a wide margin for doctrinal differences, and cries, as it goes on its heaven-born mission, "*If thy heart be as mine, give me thy hand!*" The Church belongs to Christ; and every true Christian has a right within her pale. An association that refuses admission to one who gives the clearest evidence of experimental and practical piety, is unworthy the name of a Christian Church. *Head*-religion may answer to make Church-members, but it takes *heart*-religion to make *Christians.* Some people are so thoroughly saturated with sectarianism, that they will never become decent specimens of Christianity till this wretched leaven is purged away. And the disease is so deeply seated that they will need to take many allopathic doses of gospel charity!

Oh! what formidable walls has bigotry reared, to keep asunder those who ought to be one in Christ! Churchianity shrivels the soul into contemptible narrowness; but Christianity enlarges the heart and fills it with genuine charity and generous impulses.

UMI

Church rivalry has achieved a glorious success, if success consists in gorgeous temples, tall steeples, loud-sounding bells, thundering organs, ostentatious dressing, theatrical singing, pointless praying, rhetorical preaching, careless hearing, and unscriptural practicing!

Much of the current worship is done by proxy. Lazy religionists surrender their sacred rights to others. They take it for granted that the preacher is on the right track, and readily swallow whatever may be doled out from the pulpit, without using their own brains in searching for the hidden treasures of truth. Thus religious ideas are transmitted from generation to generation, until tradition exerts a more powerful influence than the Bible in molding the sentiments of men. There comes to be a fashionable *faith*, as well as a fashionable dress. To embrace a certain stereotyped circle of doctrinal views entitles a man to the claim of "orthodoxy;" but let him not venture one step out of the beaten track, if he would not be denounced as a deluded heretic! But few have the moral courage to question the decisions of the Church, much less to discard what she has labeled as "orthodox." The verdict of a few leading denominations has thus grown up into a threatening *tyranny*; and the multitude cannot think of stemming the mighty tide. So they bow down in their narrow enslavement and worship this curiously-fashioned but pious-looking idol—*the Church!* Since all idolatry is an abomination to God, we have no more right to worship a *church* than we have to worship a *golden calf!* We rob the Lord of his rightful honor, and ourselves of the highest bliss of Christianity, by looking to the Church too much, and "looking unto Jesus" too little. What can be done to deal a staggering blow to this cruel church-worship of the day, and at the same time give us more exalted and ravishing views of Jesus Christ? There is a grand failure to carry out the ultimate design, when the appliances of the gospel result only in the production of *Churchianity*. Our perception, our prayers, our faith, and our adoration must overleap the narrow precincts of the outward Church, and rise up to the eternal throne! "*Worship God!*"

III. *Christian fellowship and Church fellowship are not identical.* The followers of Christ are called upon to "love one another with a pure heart fervently." Indeed, this is one of the Scriptural tests of discipleship. "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." All Christians constitute one family, and *love* is the golden tie designed to

bind their hearts together around the common cross. But love is a tender plant that needs to be reared with a gentle hand. Hence the many exhortations of Scripture to "consider one another"—to "be kindly affectioned one to another"—to esteem others better than ourselves—to "bear one another's burdens"—to exercise a forgiving spirit—to "let brotherly love continue"—to "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." All such injunctions point out the danger of alienated feelings and poisoned affections, and show the importance of making a special effort to promote Christian unity and love. How disastrous are the results of not regarding these gospel precepts! Trivial differences of opinion are considered a sufficient ground for dividing the religious world into a thousand rival sects. Thus the general Church presents the strange spectacle of a thousand hostile armies, moving about with drawn swords and bristling bayonets, taking advantage of every weak point, and expending far more ammunition in firing into each other's ranks than they do in battering down the bulwarks of sin and Satan. This general jargon is by no means adapted to make a deep and favorable impression upon the hearts of sinners, but is especially calculated to convert the world to infidelity, and forestall the triumphs of the cross.

Most of the Churches have erected a false standard of piety, and made unauthorized tests of membership. *Churchianity* insists upon similarity of *opinions;* while *Christianity* makes a wide margin for doctrinal differences, and cries, as it goes on its heaven-born mission, "*If thy heart be as mine, give me thy hand!*" The Church belongs to Christ; and every true Christian has a right within her pale. An association that refuses admission to one who gives the clearest evidence of experimental and practical piety, is unworthy the name of a Christian Church. *Head*-religion may answer to make Church-members, but it takes *heart*-religion to make *Christians.* Some people are so thoroughly saturated with sectarianism, that they will never become decent specimens of Christianity till this wretched leaven is purged away. And the disease is so deeply seated that they will need to take many allopathic doses of gospel charity!

Oh! what formidable walls has bigotry reared, to keep asunder those who ought to be one in Christ! Churchianity shrivels the soul into contemptible narrowness; but Christianity enlarges the heart and fills it with genuine charity and generous impulses.

UMI

The former turns men into partisans and proselytes: the latter leads to deeds of noble daring for the honor of God and the elevation of man, without distinction of color, dialect, race, or sex. Our true position is to recognize goodness wherever we find it, and to denounce evil wherever it lifts its unholy head. "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good," and throw the rest away. No Church is *wholly wrong;* no Church is *unexceptionably right.* Let us be careful, therefore, that our eulogiums upon Churches are not too emphatic, nor our denunciations too bitter. Remember that even "our Church" may have something to condemn, while some other Church may have much to commend. How glorious is that moral heroism that dares break through the walls of sectarian bigotry, and join hands with *all* the friends of God, in pulling down the ramparts of the devil and building up that great temple of grace whose top-stone shall be laid amid the shoutings of immortal triumph!

Much that passes for Christian love is found, when thoroughly tested, to be nothing but Church love or party love. Let a Christian brother be compelled, by a course of candid investigation, to change his views or his Church relations, and how certainly the cold shoulder so quickly shown him will tell of the disfellowship that has crept into the heart! Christ may smile upon the dear disciple as sweetly as ever, but the Church knits her brow and enters her protest against his being the recipient of any more favors from above! *This is Churchianity.*

A few years ago, a brother was attending a camp-meeting held under the auspices of a Church with which he was formerly connected. Said the presiding officer, one day, "Br. P——, I would let you preach *if you had not left our Church.*" And yet that brother had maintained his Christian integrity at every step, and had not even changed his doctrinal views. He had simply changed his Church relations; and the Church-worshiping priests "passed by on the other side." We well know a Christian minister who was recently stationed for two years in a young and thriving city in Western New York. He labored hard, and succeeded in erecting a neat and commodious church edifice for the Society whom he served. The church was built under the floating banner of free seats and free salvation. In less than two years after it was dedicated, that minister, having so far modified his views as to reject the doctrine of man's inherent immortality, was utterly refused the privilege of preaching a single sermon in that

consecrated temple, whose erection cost him travel and toil and tears! *This is Churchianity.* Thank God, that rejected minister has found that all Churches are not prison-houses, and all Christians are not bigots! His heart is cheered by the assurance that falls like heavenly music upon his ear: "Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it." Churchianity requires me to subscribe to specified creeds and polities; but Christianity overleaps denominational walls, grasps the hand of every genuine lover of Jesus, and shouts the battle on to victory. With Heaven-born impulses, and a heart as broad as all creation, a well-developed Christian rejoices in truth and goodness wherever found, and looks exultingly to that glorious consummation, when all who have been washed in the same blood, and sanctified by the same Spirit, shall stand on the plains of Paradise and sing the same song of endless triumph!

PAUL'S "DESIRE TO DEPART."

Dear Br. Himes: Your kindness in forwarding me a review of the article entitled Paul's "Desire to Depart," which was first published in *The World's Crisis*, and afterward copied into *The Voice of the West*, I duly appreciate, and gladly avail myself of the opportunity you so freely offer, to furnish my reviewer a reply.[1]

In a controversy such as the present I had supposed that an opponent's position could not be successfully assailed without an appeal to "the law and the testimony;" but our friend seems to think differently; and disdaining this old-fashioned custom, has adopted a much quicker, and certainly in the present instance a much easier mode, by substituting bold assertion for forcible argument.

I can assure our friend that those charges against me of "unwarranted dogmatism," of "dishonesty," and "ignorance," with which he has introduced and interspersed his review, have fallen quite harmlessly upon my position, and have led me to suspect that they would not have been preferred if Scriptural argument

[1] The "reviewer" referred to is the Rev. L. Osler, of Providence, R. I., whose reply to Br. Davidson's first article on this question appeared in *The Advent Herald* for January 2, 1869. After some delay we succeeded in getting a copy of this review into Br. Davidson's hands, which elicited this rejoinder, originally designed for the columns of *The Voice of the West*, but finally reserved for these pages.—Ed.

UMI

The former turns men into partisans and proselytes: the latter leads to deeds of noble daring for the honor of God and the elevation of man, without distinction of color, dialect, race, or sex. Our true position is to recognize goodness wherever we find it, and to denounce evil wherever it lifts its unholy head. "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good," and throw the rest away. No Church is *wholly wrong;* no Church is *unexceptionably right.* Let us be careful, therefore, that our eulogiums upon Churches are not too emphatic, nor our denunciations too bitter. Remember that even "our Church" may have something to condemn, while some other Church may have much to commend. How glorious is that moral heroism that dares break through the walls of sectarian bigotry, and join hands with *all* the friends of God, in pulling down the ramparts of the devil and building up that great temple of grace whose top-stone shall be laid amid the shoutings of immortal triumph!

Much that passes for Christian love is found, when thoroughly tested, to be nothing but Church love or party love. Let a Christian brother be compelled, by a course of candid investigation, to change his views or his Church relations, and how certainly the cold shoulder so quickly shown him will tell of the disfellowship that has crept into the heart! Christ may smile upon the dear disciple as sweetly as ever, but the Church knits her brow and enters her protest against his being the recipient of any more favors from above! *This is Churchianity.*

A few years ago, a brother was attending a camp-meeting held under the auspices of a Church with which he was formerly connected. Said the presiding officer, one day, "Br. P——, I would let you preach *if you had not left our Church.*" And yet that brother had maintained his Christian integrity at every step, and had not even changed his doctrinal views. He had simply changed his Church relations; and the Church-worshiping priests "passed by on the other side." We well know a Christian minister who was recently stationed for two years in a young and thriving city in Western New York. He labored hard, and succeeded in erecting a neat and commodious church edifice for the Society whom he served. The church was built under the floating banner of free seats and free salvation. In less than two years after it was dedicated, that minister, having so far modified his views as to reject the doctrine of man's inherent immortality, was utterly refused the privilege of preaching a single sermon in that

consecrated temple, whose erection cost him travel and toil and tears! *This is Churchianity.* Thank God, that rejected minister has found that all Churches are not prison-houses, and all Christians are not bigots! His heart is cheered by the assurance that falls like heavenly music upon his ear: "Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it." Churchianity requires me to subscribe to specified creeds and polities; but Christianity overleaps denominational walls, grasps the hand of every genuine lover of Jesus, and shouts the battle on to victory. With Heaven-born impulses, and a heart as broad as all creation, a well-developed Christian rejoices in truth and goodness wherever found, and looks exultingly to that glorious consummation, when all who have been washed in the same blood, and sanctified by the same Spirit, shall stand on the plains of Paradise and sing the same song of endless triumph!

PAUL'S "DESIRE TO DEPART."

Dear Br. Himes: Your kindness in forwarding me a review of the article entitled Paul's "Desire to Depart," which was first published in *The World's Crisis*, and afterward copied into *The Voice of the West*, I duly appreciate, and gladly avail myself of the opportunity you so freely offer, to furnish my reviewer a reply.[1]

In a controversy such as the present I had supposed that an opponent's position could not be successfully assailed without an appeal to "the law and the testimony;" but our friend seems to think differently; and disdaining this old-fashioned custom, has adopted a much quicker, and certainly in the present instance a much easier mode, by substituting bold assertion for forcible argument.

I can assure our friend that those charges against me of "unwarranted dogmatism," of "dishonesty," and "ignorance," with which he has introduced and interspersed his review, have fallen quite harmlessly upon my position, and have led me to suspect that they would not have been preferred if Scriptural argument

[1] The "reviewer" referred to is the Rev. L. Osler, of Providence, R. I., whose reply to Br. Davidson's first article on this question appeared in *The Advent Herald* for January 2, 1869. After some delay we succeeded in getting a copy of this review into Br. Davidson's hands, which elicited this rejoinder, originally designed for the columns of *The Voice of the West*, but finally reserved for these pages.—Ed.

UMI

had been forthcoming, and to wish, for his own sake, that they had been withheld: for in the event of their proving untrue, he must be found in the rather awkward position for a Christian elder to occupy, of having borne "false witness against his neighbor."

The passage under consideration, with its connection, as rendered in our common English version, is as follows:

"For to me to live is Christ, and to die gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better." (Phil. 1: 21-23.)

In my former article my argument rested on what I endeavored to show was the wrong rendering of the phrase in v. 23—"having a desire to depart," which, I contended, should be rendered—"the ardent desire having for the returning," and then the apostle's meaning would be, that though pressed by a martyr's death on the one hand, and a life of tribulation on the other, he longed for *another* event, viz: the returning of Christ, which would be immeasurably better than either of the other alternatives.

But then my authority for rendering *analusai*, by returning being questioned, I reply, as stated in my former article, that the *lexicons* render the word return, and that King James' translators so render it in Luke 12: 36. And, further, that it is impossible to translate the phrase "*eis to analusai*" by to depart, without outraging every law upon which grammatical construction depends. Had *to depart* or *to return* been the way the apostle wished to express himself, I mean the verb in the infinitive mood, then the single word *analusein* was all that was needed or proper to thus express himself. And scholar that he was, he never could have used the phrase "for the departing" to express *to depart:* but if he meant the returning of his Lord whom he so ardently longed to see, he could not have properly expressed himself in any other form than the phrase *eis to analusai*, as we have it in the Greek text. And Dean Alford, whose attainments as a critical Greek scholar none will question, translates the phrase in this very form —"having a desire for the departing and being with Christ." This argument our friend has prudently left untouched.

My reviewer, in harmony with the popular theology, first represents Paul as in doubt and perplexity as to whether he would choose to live on or to die, and being in a strait between these two, viz: life and death, he declares, "*What I shall choose I wot not;*" and yet in the same breath they tell us that he has made a most

deliberate and hearty choice *to depart*, that is *to die:* and having thus taken away *one side of the strait*, he gets out of the perplexity, and his language, "What I shall choose I wot not," is no longer true. And let it be borne in mind, that whatever it is that the apostle desires here, he desires it with his *whole* heart. (*Epithumian*, rendered desire, means *burning* desire, *ardent* longing.) And if my reviewer insists that his own death was the object of the apostle's intense desire here, the easiest way to prove that is to adduce those instances in his writings where he speaks of his own death; and if we find him speaking of it as a *desirable* event, then it may it be that he desires it here. Hear then his testimony on this subject to his brethren at Corinth:

"For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came upon us in Asia, that we were pressed out of strength, above measure; insomuch that we *despaired* even of life. But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who *raiseth the dead;* who *delivered* us from so great a *death*, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet *deliver* us." (2 Cor. 1: 8, 9.)

And of his brother and fellow-soldier, Epaphroditus, who "was sick nigh unto death" (Phil. 2: 27), he testifies to God's *mercy* in restoring him from the very event that my reviewer declares Paul desired. And at the close of the apostle's course, when he stood looking the "last enemy" full in the face, his is the language of meek and calm submission to an event that he *cannot avert*, rather than joyous satisfaction that the object of his desire had at last arrived.

"For I am now ready to be offered [or sacrificed], and the time of my departure [dissolution] is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at *that day:* and not to me only, but to all them also who love *his appearing*." (2 Tim. 4: 6-8.)

In his language to the Corinthians, quoted above, when the apostle was so hard pressed by death that he *despaired* of life, he gives our friend little room to suspect that that death from which he so earnestly thanked God for delivering him was the same *event* for which he so ardently longs in his letter to the Philippians. And we here challenge our reviewer to find us *one single sentence* in the fourteen epistles that Paul wrote, that expresses his desire to die, apart from the passage we are considering.

I need not then occupy space in proving that the *coming again*

had been forthcoming, and to wish, for his own sake, that they had been withheld: for in the event of their proving untrue, he must be found in the rather awkward position for a Christian elder to occupy, of having borne "false witness against his neighbor."

The passage under consideration, with its connection, as rendered in our common English version, is as follows:

"For to me to live is Christ, and to die gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better." (Phil. 1: 21-23.)

In my former article my argument rested on what I endeavored to show was the wrong rendering of the phrase in v. 23—"having a desire to depart," which, I contended, should be rendered—"the ardent desire having for the returning," and then the apostle's meaning would be, that though pressed by a martyr's death on the one hand, and a life of tribulation on the other, he longed for *another* event, viz: the returning of Christ, which would be immeasurably better than either of the other alternatives.

But then my authority for rendering *analusai*, by returning being questioned, I reply, as stated in my former article, that the *lexicons* render the word return, and that King James' translators so render it in Luke 12: 36. And, further, that it is impossible to translate the phrase "*eis to analusai*" by to depart, without outraging every law upon which grammatical construction depends. Had *to depart* or *to return* been the way the apostle wished to express himself, I mean the verb in the infinitive mood, then the single word *analusein* was all that was needed or proper to thus express himself. And scholar that he was, he never could have used the phrase "for the departing" to express *to depart:* but if he meant the returning of his Lord whom he so ardently longed to see, he could not have properly expressed himself in any other form than the phrase *eis to analusai*, as we have it in the Greek text. And Dean Alford, whose attainments as a critical Greek scholar none will question, translates the phrase in this very form —"having a desire for the departing and being with Christ." This argument our friend has prudently left untouched.

My reviewer, in harmony with the popular theology, first represents Paul as in doubt and perplexity as to whether he would choose to live on or to die, and being in a strait between these two, viz: life and death, he declares, "*What I shall choose I wot not;*" and yet in the same breath they tell us that he has made a most

deliberate and hearty choice *to depart*, that is *to die:* and having thus taken away *one side of the strait*, he gets out of the perplexity, and his language, "What I shall choose I wot not," is no longer true. And let it be borne in mind, that whatever it is that the apostle desires here, he desires it with his *whole* heart. (*Epithumian*, rendered desire, means *burning* desire, *ardent* longing.) And if my reviewer insists that his own death was the object of the apostle's intense desire here, the easiest way to prove that is to adduce those instances in his writings where he speaks of his own death; and if we find him speaking of it as a *desirable* event, then it may it be that he desires it here. Hear then his testimony on this subject to his brethren at Corinth:

"For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came upon us in Asia, that we were pressed out of strength, above measure; insomuch that we *despaired* even of life. But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who *raiseth the dead;* who *delivered* us from so great a *death*, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet *deliver* us." (2 Cor. 1: 8, 9.)

And of his brother and fellow-soldier, Epaphroditus, who "was sick nigh unto death" (Phil. 2: 27), he testifies to God's *mercy* in restoring him from the very event that my reviewer declares Paul desired. And at the close of the apostle's course, when he stood looking the "last enemy" full in the face, his is the language of meek and calm submission to an event that he *cannot avert*, rather than joyous satisfaction that the object of his desire had at last arrived.

"For I am now ready to be offered [or sacrificed], and the time of my departure [dissolution] is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at *that day:* and not to me only, but to all them also who love *his appearing*." (2 Tim. 4: 6-8.)

In his language to the Corinthians, quoted above, when the apostle was so hard pressed by death that he *despaired* of life, he gives our friend little room to suspect that that death from which he so earnestly thanked God for delivering him was the same *event* for which he so ardently longs in his letter to the Philippians. And we here challenge our reviewer to find us *one single sentence* in the fourteen epistles that Paul wrote, that expresses his desire to die, apart from the passage we are considering.

I need not then occupy space in proving that the *coming again*

or *returning* of his Lord was the *chief* desire of the apostle's heart; for our friend has admitted that already. And if we have shown from the apostle's other writings, and even from the very letter to the Philippians itself, that Paul *did not desire* to die, what justification can be offered for interpreting this disputed passage in direct opposition to the apostle's plainly-expressed sentiments elsewhere?

One of the charges of injustice which my friend makes against me he states as follows:

"Now mark, he says *depart* is given in the lexicons as *one* of the meanings of *analuo*, conveying the idea that depart is an exceptional and secondary meaning of the word. The very reverse is true."

And to prove that the reverse is true, or that depart is a *primary* and *radical* meaning, rather than an exceptional and secondary one, as I maintained, he quotes three lexicons: Donnegan's, Liddell & Scott's, and Robinson's. And yet the definitions as written down by my friend himself from the first of these authorities do not mention "depart" at all! The second mentions it the last on the list but one; and the third does not mention it either, unless in New Testament instances; thus admitting that in general Greek literature the word has no such meaning as popular theology attaches to it in the New Testament: so that the charge of "unfairness" and "injustice" must be transferred from my shoulders to the authorities to which our friend has appealed to prove it: for they do not give it even a secondary meaning.

My reviewer quotes McKnight on the word *analuo* as follows:

"On the word *analuo* McKnight says: The simple word *luo* signifies to loose from a port; and the compound word *analuo* to *return* to port."

Now it is the compound *analusai* that occurs in the passage in dispute; and if that word means return, as our friend has quoted McKnight to show, why does he find fault because I have rendered it *return*, in harmony with McKnight's view? And McKnight does not stand alone in so translating it. Liddell & Scott define it return; Hinks, also, defines it return; and the translators of the Bible in James' reign so render it, as we have previously said, in Luke 12: 36—"And ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he *shall return* from the wedding." (*Pote analusei ek toon gamon.*)

My reviewer asserts that the obvious meaning here is to depart, or leave a place: but I think it still *more* obvious that it is not the departing *from* the wedding that is the subject or object of interest to the servants, but the *return* of their lord to his own house: and that this is the correct view is placed beyond doubt by the next sentence—"That when he *cometh* and knocketh." Not when he leaveth, but when he cometh.[1]

Our friend asserts that *analuo* is never used to express Christ's coming, but such words as *parousia*, *apokalupeis*, *epiphania*. True, those different words are used to express his coming, revelation, or manifestation. Sometimes he is spoken of as coming in great power and glory; and of his glorious revelation the apostle was not ignorant. But he needed not to multiply language to express those circumstances, when the simple idea of *return* included them all. The Master's own promise to his disciples was in the simple sentence, "I will come again." And correspondingly simple was the testimony of the angels who witnessed his ascension: "This same Jesus shall so come in like manner."

The conclusion, then, we think, cannot be avoided by any unbiased lover of Bible truth, that the object that Paul desires in Phil. 1: 23 could *not* be his own death, but the *returning* of Christ, which my friend admits to have been the chief desire of the apostle's heart. And for that event his desire would be expressed in earnest, hearty language. And no word in the language he wrote could give expression to a stronger desire than *epithumian*, the word he uses. And then the result, "for that is immensely better"—"the highest superlative which it is possible to form in any language," as our friend has quoted McKnight to show.

But does not Paul say that death is gain? He does. But a

[1] The following extract from Prof. Hudson's remarks on Phil. 1: 21-26 is in point here.—ED. And there are some reasons for supposing that the phrase here rendered "to depart" (*eistoanalusia*) may signify "to return," or "the release," with special allusion to the coming back of the dead from *hades*, of which the early Christians made so much. The verb here used occurs in Luke 12: 36, in the sense of "return." In twenty-two manuscripts of the Septuagint, including the Oxford, it is used in Josh. 22: 9 for the Hebrew word which always signifies "to return." And in Wisd. 2: 1, it occurs in the phrase: "neither was there any man known to have returned from the grave" (*analusas*, better *released*.) In ch. 5: 13: "An arrow . . . . . parteth the air, which immediately cometh together again" (*analuthe, returneth*). In ch. 16: 13, 14: "Thou hast power of life and death; thou leadest to the gates of *hades*, and bringest up again. But a man killeth, ... and cannot bring back (*analusai*) the soul received [into *hades*]." In 2 Macc. 8: 33: "Looking time, they returned" (*analusan*). In ch. 9: 1: "Antiochus returned (*anestrepsato*, De Wette, *surueckkehrte*) in a disorderly manner from Persia." In ch. 15: 28: "Now when the battle was done, returning again with joy" (*analusotes*). The noun as used in 2 Tim. 4: 6, may signify "release;" though the context here shows that the hopes of Paul were centered not on the event of death, but of the resurrection. (*Debt and Grace*, pp. 256-7.)

or *returning* of his Lord was the *chief* desire of the apostle's heart; for our friend has admitted that already. And if we have shown from the apostle's other writings, and even from the very letter to the Philippians itself, that Paul *did not desire* to die, what justification can be offered for interpreting this disputed passage in direct opposition to the apostle's plainly-expressed sentiments elsewhere?

One of the charges of injustice which my friend makes against me he states as follows:

"Now mark, he says *depart* is given in the lexicons as *one* of the meanings of *analuo*, conveying the idea that depart is an exceptional and secondary meaning of the word. The very reverse is true."

And to prove that the reverse is true, or that depart is a *primary* and *radical* meaning, rather than an exceptional and secondary one, as I maintained, he quotes three lexicons: Donnegan's, Liddell & Scott's, and Robinson's. And yet the definitions as written down by my friend himself from the first of these authorities do not mention "depart" at all! The second mentions it the last on the list but one; and the third does not mention it either, unless in New Testament instances; thus admitting that in general Greek literature the word has no such meaning as popular theology attaches to it in the New Testament: so that the charge of "unfairness" and "injustice" must be transferred from my shoulders to the authorities to which our friend has appealed to prove it: for they do not give it even a secondary meaning.

My reviewer quotes McKnight on the word *analuo* as follows:

"On the word *analuo* McKnight says: The simple word *luo* signifies to loose from a port; and the compound word *analuo* to *return* to port."

Now it is the compound *analusai* that occurs in the passage in dispute; and if that word means return, as our friend has quoted McKnight to show, why does he find fault because I have rendered it *return*, in harmony with McKnight's view? And McKnight does not stand alone in so translating it. Liddell & Scott define it return; Hinks, also, defines it return; and the translators of the Bible in James' reign so render it, as we have previously said, in Luke 12: 36—"And ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he *shall return* from the wedding." (*Pote analusei ek toon gamon.*)

My reviewer asserts that the obvious meaning here is to depart, or leave a place: but I think it still *more* obvious that it is not the departing *from* the wedding that is the subject or object of interest to the servants, but the *return* of their lord to his own house: and that this is the correct view is placed beyond doubt by the next sentence—"That when he *cometh* and knocketh." Not when he leaveth, but when he cometh.[1]

Our friend asserts that *analuo* is never used to express Christ's coming, but such words as *parousia*, *apokalupeis*, *epiphania*. True, those different words are used to express his coming, revelation, or manifestation. Sometimes he is spoken of as coming in great power and glory; and of his glorious revelation the apostle was not ignorant. But he needed not to multiply language to express those circumstances, when the simple idea of *return* included them all. The Master's own promise to his disciples was in the simple sentence, "I will come again." And correspondingly simple was the testimony of the angels who witnessed his ascension: "This same Jesus shall so come in like manner."

The conclusion, then, we think, cannot be avoided by any unbiased lover of Bible truth, that the object that Paul desires in Phil. 1: 23 could *not* be his own death, but the *returning* of Christ, which my friend admits to have been the chief desire of the apostle's heart. And for that event his desire would be expressed in earnest, hearty language. And no word in the language he wrote could give expression to a stronger desire than *epithumian*, the word he uses. And then the result, "for that is immensely better"—"the highest superlative which it is possible to form in any language," as our friend has quoted McKnight to show.

But does not Paul say that death is gain? He does. But a

[1] The following extract from Prof. Hudson's remarks on Phil. 1: 21-26 is in point here.—ED. And there are some reasons for supposing that the phrase here rendered "to depart" (*eistoanalusia*) may signify "to return," or "the release," with special allusion to the coming back of the dead from *hades*, of which the early Christians made so much. The verb here used occurs in Luke 12: 36, in the sense of "return." In twenty-two manuscripts of the Septuagint, including the Oxford, it is used in Josh. 22: 9 for the Hebrew word which always signifies "to return." And in Wisd. 2: 1, it occurs in the phrase: "neither was there any man known to have returned from the grave" (*analusas*, better *released*.) In ch. 5: 13: "An arrow . . . . . parteth the air, which immediately cometh together again" (*analuthe, returneth*). In ch. 16: 13, 14: "Thou hast power of life and death; thou leadest to the gates of *hades*, and bringest up again. But a man killeth, ... and cannot bring back (*analusai*) the soul received [into *hades*]." In 2 Macc. 8: 33: "Looking time, they returned" (*analusan*). In ch. 9: 1: "Antiochus returned (*anestrepsato*, De Wette, *surueckkehrte*) in a disorderly manner from Persia." In ch. 15: 28: "Now when the battle was done, returning again with joy" (*analusotes*). The noun as used in 2 Tim. 4: 6, may signify "release;" though the context here shows that the hopes of Paul were centered not on the event of death, but of the resurrection. (*Debt and Grace*, pp. 256-7.)

little attention to the context will show that my argument on this point in my former article was scriptural and sound. Paul says in v. 20: "But with all boldness as always so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or death." If Paul lives he labors on in his Master's vineyard, building up his Church, and preaching to perishing sinners the glorious news of life and immortality through Christ; and if he dies a martyr's death, and seals his testimony with his blood, the cause of his adorable Master is still magnified, and gain brought to the Redeemer through the fidelity of his servant.

The apostle was so completely absorbed in his Master's work, that he had no will of his own in the matter; but was entirely prepared for any circumstance that his Master's cause required, whether life or death. But he longed for *another* circumstance, immensely preferable to either life or death: that was the *returning* of Christ, and to be with him.

With language so plain and pointed before my reviewer, can he furnish any honorable reason for his assertion that I placed Paul in a strait between two things: that one of these was Christ's coming, and that the apostle was in doubt and perplexity as to whether he should choose the latter? He has evidently unwavering confidence in the power of misrepresentation to remove difficulties that beset the path he wants to travel; but there is some danger that his readers might prefer a little Scriptural argument. But that seems a rare commodity in our brother's neighborhood.

He also seizes a mere preliminary to the argument stated above, and criticises it as my main argument on this point, although the terms of its introduction show that I regarded it merely as a contingency. I mean the argument that death might in some exceptional cases be a gain, where the living man is the object of fierce persecution, or the subject of severe suffering, and where he would sink into that condition in which, according to Job, "the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest," in the confident hope of living again when Jesus comes. This view, entertained by many of my brethren, and supported by a good array of Scripture, may be correct; yet I laid no stress whatever upon it. The gain that the apostle speaks of I doubt not is precisely similar to that mentioned by Christ in John's last chapter, where he says to Peter, "When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldst not."

"This spake he signifying by what death he should *glorify God*." Would it not be gain to Peter thus to glorify God by suffering for his name? Would it not be gain to Paul also to magnify Christ in his body, even by a martyr's death?

My reviewer says: "The use of Christ's language to the Jews reveals either ignorance of Scripture teaching or deceitfulness in handling the word of God;" and asks, "Did he mean to place the wicked Jews on the same footing with the disciples?" Perhaps the reader can solve the problem for himself by just looking at the Savior's words: "As I said unto the Jews, so now say I unto you: Whither I go ye cannot come."

In my simplicity I had supposed these words indicated plainly that the disciples could *not* go whither Jesus has gone, and that to meet their case he had promised, "I will come again and take you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also." If the explanation that our brother offers be the correct one, namely: that the disciples could not then go, but would follow him to heaven at their death, then what need for the promise: "I will come again and take you to myself, *that* where I am there ye may be also," if they would go to him centuries *before* his coming again?

If I were dealing with an ordinary supporter of popular theology he would tell me that Christ came again to each one at his death: but then that would give us thousands of comings; and there only *two* mentioned in the word of truth—the *first* and *second*: and in those two my reviewer professes to believe. The first is past; he is looking for the second, which is still in the future. And though he admits that the coming again is still future, with an unaccountable inconsistency he asserts that the disciples have been received by Christ, although the Lord's words, "I will come again and receive you," connect the two events inseparably together: and from this language no man can legitimately conclude that the disciples are with Christ, unless he can prove that Christ has come again.

It seems to me an awkward position that my friend occupies, to be still looking for the second coming, and yet laboring with his whole might to prove that saints are received by Christ at death, and are with him without his coming again; and consequently the promise, "I will come again and receive you," never was, nor never can be fulfilled to those to whom it was first addressed; nor to the many thousands who have died since the apostle's time: and when he does come he can only fulfill it to

little attention to the context will show that my argument on this point in my former article was scriptural and sound. Paul says in v. 20: "But with all boldness as always so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or death." If Paul lives he labors on in his Master's vineyard, building up his Church, and preaching to perishing sinners the glorious news of life and immortality through Christ; and if he dies a martyr's death, and seals his testimony with his blood, the cause of his adorable Master is still magnified, and gain brought to the Redeemer through the fidelity of his servant.

The apostle was so completely absorbed in his Master's work, that he had no will of his own in the matter; but was entirely prepared for any circumstance that his Master's cause required, whether life or death. But he longed for *another* circumstance, immensely preferable to either life or death: that was the *returning* of Christ, and to be with him.

With language so plain and pointed before my reviewer, can he furnish any honorable reason for his assertion that I placed Paul in a strait between two things: that one of these was Christ's coming, and that the apostle was in doubt and perplexity as to whether he should choose the latter? He has evidently unwavering confidence in the power of misrepresentation to remove difficulties that beset the path he wants to travel; but there is some danger that his readers might prefer a little Scriptural argument. But that seems a rare commodity in our brother's neighborhood.

He also seizes a mere preliminary to the argument stated above, and criticises it as my main argument on this point, although the terms of its introduction show that I regarded it merely as a contingency. I mean the argument that death might in some exceptional cases be a gain, where the living man is the object of fierce persecution, or the subject of severe suffering, and where he would sink into that condition in which, according to Job, "the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest," in the confident hope of living again when Jesus comes. This view, entertained by many of my brethren, and supported by a good array of Scripture, may be correct; yet I laid no stress whatever upon it. The gain that the apostle speaks of I doubt not is precisely similar to that mentioned by Christ in John's last chapter, where he says to Peter, "When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldst not."

"This spake he signifying by what death he should *glorify God*." Would it not be gain to Peter thus to glorify God by suffering for his name? Would it not be gain to Paul also to magnify Christ in his body, even by a martyr's death?

My reviewer says: "The use of Christ's language to the Jews reveals either ignorance of Scripture teaching or deceitfulness in handling the word of God;" and asks, "Did he mean to place the wicked Jews on the same footing with the disciples?" Perhaps the reader can solve the problem for himself by just looking at the Savior's words: "As I said unto the Jews, so now say I unto you: Whither I go ye cannot come."

In my simplicity I had supposed these words indicated plainly that the disciples could *not* go whither Jesus has gone, and that to meet their case he had promised, "I will come again and take you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also." If the explanation that our brother offers be the correct one, namely: that the disciples could not then go, but would follow him to heaven at their death, then what need for the promise: "I will come again and take you to myself, *that* where I am there ye may be also," if they would go to him centuries *before* his coming again?

If I were dealing with an ordinary supporter of popular theology he would tell me that Christ came again to each one at his death: but then that would give us thousands of comings; and there only *two* mentioned in the word of truth—the *first* and *second*: and in those two my reviewer professes to believe. The first is past; he is looking for the second, which is still in the future. And though he admits that the coming again is still future, with an unaccountable inconsistency he asserts that the disciples have been received by Christ, although the Lord's words, "I will come again and receive you," connect the two events inseparably together: and from this language no man can legitimately conclude that the disciples are with Christ, unless he can prove that Christ has come again.

It seems to me an awkward position that my friend occupies, to be still looking for the second coming, and yet laboring with his whole might to prove that saints are received by Christ at death, and are with him without his coming again; and consequently the promise, "I will come again and receive you," never was, nor never can be fulfilled to those to whom it was first addressed; nor to the many thousands who have died since the apostle's time: and when he does come he can only fulfill it to

the living, for all the dead were received by him already, each at his own death; and thus the order of the promise has been reversed; for instead of his *coming* to them, they have *gone* to him.

But it will be found uphill work for my friend, even with some orthodox assistance, to reverse and nullify the promise we are considering. For Paul's language to his Thessalonian brethren who were sorrowing for deceased relatives shows most clearly, that the doctrine of being admitted to heaven, or Christ's presence, at death, and of course without a resurrection, had not been invented in his day.

"For we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain shall not prevent [or precede] them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up *together* with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 15–17.)

Here we find the fulfillment of the promise, "I will come again;" and having come again he finds all his children here. Some like weary watchers have gone to rest, and sleep the sleep that knows no waking till the "trump of God" calls forth the dead; and some on the watchtowers, awake, bearing the burden and heat of the day, with wistful eye and longing heart still pray like the disciples of old, "Thy kingdom come!" But though awake they have no precedence over the sleepers; for "the dead in Christ must rise first," and then the grand company of the redeemed, all changed, the sleepers and the watchers alike, from corruptible to incorruptible, from mortal to immortal, are caught up *together* to meet the Lord in the air: and then from ten thousand immortal tongues roll forth the now heartfelt and appropriate words of Isaiah 25: 9: "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him!"

My reviewer explains to us that the Lord's language to Peter, "Whither I go thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards" (John 13: 36), taught him, and teaches us, that at his death he would follow him to another world. Peter could and did follow his Master to death, as according to his own testimony the Lord had previously shown him: "Knowing that shortly I must put off my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." (2 Pet. 1: 11.) But he certainly could not be with his Lord there, for "he rose from the dead," says Paul, "according to the Scriptures." "He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God," according to Mark, and "was parted from them and carried up into heaven," according to Luke. Did our friend ever read that Peter rose from the dead and was received up into heaven? *No.* Why then ask us to believe it? Why ask us to believe and teach a doctrine that Peter neither believed nor taught? Why take us to task for believing, as did Peter, that the patriarch David is *not* ascended into the heavens? (Acts 2: 34.) Why thrust upon us a dogma of Rome, that she received from Plato, and substituted for the hope that cheered the primitive Christians? viz: the coming of Christ and the "resurrection of the dead," whose faith is to this day revealed by the single Latin word, "*Resurgam*" (I will rise again), so frequently found on their tombs in the catacombs of Rome.

To say that the resurrection was past already in Paul's day was a heresy that he exposed and condemned: but if he lived in our day, he would find a theory very prevalent that can get along quite well without a resurrection; and even if it was past already it would be no great matter. He would discover how simple and ill-instructed he was when he wrote to the Philippians—"If by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead." For modern theology could tell him how he could attain to heaven and its glories without a resurrection, and show him how little necessity there was for placing so much dependence on it; as at death he was only separated from his "tabernacle of clay," and lived on in the conscious enjoyment of heavenly happiness until the end of the age, when he would be taken back again to earth and put into a new body; and that would be called the resurrection of Paul. I'm afraid this would astonish the apostle; and reasoning that as he had lived some two thousand years without this new body, might he not have lived forever without it, and never perished whether there was a resurrection or no? And if any of the Corinthians were there, they could hardly help feeling that Paul deceived them when he said, "They also that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished," "if the dead rise not."

My reviewer says:

"No just criticism or explanation of Paul's language can make him a Sadducee on the *nature* of the human spirit, or its condition in death."

Did not the Sadducee deny the *existence* of angels and

the living, for all the dead were received by him already, each at his own death; and thus the order of the promise has been reversed; for instead of his *coming* to them, they have *gone* to him.

But it will be found uphill work for my friend, even with some orthodox assistance, to reverse and nullify the promise we are considering. For Paul's language to his Thessalonian brethren who were sorrowing for deceased relatives shows most clearly, that the doctrine of being admitted to heaven, or Christ's presence, at death, and of course without a resurrection, had not been invented in his day.

"For we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain shall not prevent [or precede] them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up *together* with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 15–17.)

Here we find the fulfillment of the promise, "I will come again;" and having come again he finds all his children here. Some like weary watchers have gone to rest, and sleep the sleep that knows no waking till the "trump of God" calls forth the dead; and some on the watchtowers, awake, bearing the burden and heat of the day, with wistful eye and longing heart still pray like the disciples of old, "Thy kingdom come!" But though awake they have no precedence over the sleepers; for "the dead in Christ must rise first," and then the grand company of the redeemed, all changed, the sleepers and the watchers alike, from corruptible to incorruptible, from mortal to immortal, are caught up *together* to meet the Lord in the air: and then from ten thousand immortal tongues roll forth the now heartfelt and appropriate words of Isaiah 25: 9: "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him!"

My reviewer explains to us that the Lord's language to Peter, "Whither I go thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards" (John 13: 36), taught him, and teaches us, that at his death he would follow him to another world. Peter could and did follow his Master to death, as according to his own testimony the Lord had previously shown him: "Knowing that shortly I must put off my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." (2 Pet. 1: 11.) But he certainly could not be with his Lord there, for "he rose from the dead," says Paul, "according to the Scriptures." "He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God," according to Mark, and "was parted from them and carried up into heaven," according to Luke. Did our friend ever read that Peter rose from the dead and was received up into heaven? *No.* Why then ask us to believe it? Why ask us to believe and teach a doctrine that Peter neither believed nor taught? Why take us to task for believing, as did Peter, that the patriarch David is *not* ascended into the heavens? (Acts 2: 34.) Why thrust upon us a dogma of Rome, that she received from Plato, and substituted for the hope that cheered the primitive Christians? viz: the coming of Christ and the "resurrection of the dead," whose faith is to this day revealed by the single Latin word, "*Resurgam*" (I will rise again), so frequently found on their tombs in the catacombs of Rome.

To say that the resurrection was past already in Paul's day was a heresy that he exposed and condemned: but if he lived in our day, he would find a theory very prevalent that can get along quite well without a resurrection; and even if it was past already it would be no great matter. He would discover how simple and ill-instructed he was when he wrote to the Philippians—"If by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead." For modern theology could tell him how he could attain to heaven and its glories without a resurrection, and show him how little necessity there was for placing so much dependence on it; as at death he was only separated from his "tabernacle of clay," and lived on in the conscious enjoyment of heavenly happiness until the end of the age, when he would be taken back again to earth and put into a new body; and that would be called the resurrection of Paul. I'm afraid this would astonish the apostle; and reasoning that as he had lived some two thousand years without this new body, might he not have lived forever without it, and never perished whether there was a resurrection or no? And if any of the Corinthians were there, they could hardly help feeling that Paul deceived them when he said, "They also that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished," "if the dead rise not."

My reviewer says:

"No just criticism or explanation of Paul's language can make him a Sadducee on the *nature* of the human spirit, or its condition in death."

Did not the Sadducee deny the *existence* of angels and

spirits, rather than hold erroneous views respecting their *nature?* Did he not also deny the resurrection of the dead? Certainly: and no just criticism of Paul's language can make him a Sadducee in *any* respect; although the efforts of my reviewer and his brethren tend strongly in that direction. For if their views, that Paul and Peter and all other saints can attain to and enjoy heavenly glories without a resurrection from the dead, be correct, then the resurrection is, to say the very least, unnecessary: and should the Sadducee eventually turn out correct, and no resurrection ever take place, what loss, I ask, would saints suffer? Would their life be in danger? No, for that did not depend upon a "resurrection to life." Would their happiness ever be incomplete? No, for being in God's presence, the unerring record testifies, "there is *fullness of joy*, and pleasures for evermore." Who then makes Paul the Sadducee?

In support of his views our friend quotes Paul's language to the Corinthians, "willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." But what he understands by being absent from the body he has not told us. I therefore am left to infer that the popular understanding of the passage is in harmony with his own, viz: that Paul would be absent from the body at death, previous to the resurrection. But the apostle's language both to Titus and Timothy does not give much countenance to the idea that he expected to be present with the Lord during the time that he was a *subject of death.* To Titus he says, "Looking for that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." (ch. 2: 13.) It was the glorious appearing of Jesus Christ that the apostle was looking for at the end of his career, rather than to be with the Lord *before* his appearing. And to Timothy he says (2 Tim. 4: 6): "The time of my *analusis* [dissolution] is at hand. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown, which the Lord the righteous Judge will give me at *that day:* and not to me only, but unto all them also who love his *appearing.*"

Here again the appearing is the only object of comfort to the apostle. But if he cherished another and more immediate ground of comfort, that of being immediately admitted to Christ's presence at death, why does he not intimate it to his beloved Timothy? Is not his silence to be explained by believing that he knew of no such comfort? but had his confidence (as he had previously said to the Corinthians) in "God, who raiseth the dead," and almost at

the close of this letter to Timothy, the last he ever wrote (2 Tim. 4: 18), he says: "The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and *will preserve* me unto his heavenly kingdom."

Paul knew that the death which was now approaching him was a dissolution of the man, a "returning of the dust to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it;" and hence his trust that God would preserve him unto his heavenly kingdom: and this language clearly indicates that Paul's spirit was with God before Paul was conceived, or born; and, also, that the matter or dust was in the earth before it was organized into the man Paul, and vitalized by the spirit or breath of life: for neither the one nor the other could return to where they had never been. And if Paul possessed no conscious existence previous to his being organized, by what law of logic are we to hold that when he becomes *disorganized* by death he can still retain his consciousness?

The Psalmist, speaking of the beasts (Ps. 104: 29), says: "Thou takest away their spirit [or breath], they die and return to their dust." So God takes away the spirit of the beast, as well as man. But does it therefore follow that because the spirit of life that God only can give to animal as well as man, is said to return to him, or be taken away by him, the being it animated returns too, and lives on, having simply changed one kind of life for another, rather than life for death?

But what does the passage in 2 Cor. 5 mean?

I think ordinary attention to the context would show that the apostle is comparing the present mortal and corruptible condition with the immortal and incorruptible; and earnestly desires the one to replace the other, that, as he expresses it, "mortality might be swallowed up of life." The phraseology the apostle employs when compared with similar language that he elsewhere uses, clearly shows that he is here considering two states, or conditions of being, and *two only:* and that these two are the *temporal* and the *eternal* (ch. 4: 18), not the temporal and the *intermediate*, as my reviewer teaches. "*Not* that we would be unclothed," says Paul. He had no notion of the unclothed or disembodied state that the hymn-books tell us so much about now-a-days; but looked forward to the perfect and eternal state, when the corruptible should have put on incorruption, and the mortal immortality. Then the saying would be brought to pass, "Death is swallowed up of victory!" Or, as he here expresses it, "mor-

spirits, rather than hold erroneous views respecting their *nature?* Did he not also deny the resurrection of the dead? Certainly: and no just criticism of Paul's language can make him a Sadducee in *any* respect; although the efforts of my reviewer and his brethren tend strongly in that direction. For if their views, that Paul and Peter and all other saints can attain to and enjoy heavenly glories without a resurrection from the dead, be correct, then the resurrection is, to say the very least, unnecessary: and should the Sadducee eventually turn out correct, and no resurrection ever take place, what loss, I ask, would saints suffer? Would their life be in danger? No, for that did not depend upon a "resurrection to life." Would their happiness ever be incomplete? No, for being in God's presence, the unerring record testifies, "there is *fullness of joy*, and pleasures for evermore." Who then makes Paul the Sadducee?

In support of his views our friend quotes Paul's language to the Corinthians, "willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." But what he understands by being absent from the body he has not told us. I therefore am left to infer that the popular understanding of the passage is in harmony with his own, viz: that Paul would be absent from the body at death, previous to the resurrection. But the apostle's language both to Titus and Timothy does not give much countenance to the idea that he expected to be present with the Lord during the time that he was a *subject of death.* To Titus he says, "Looking for that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." (ch. 2: 13.) It was the glorious appearing of Jesus Christ that the apostle was looking for at the end of his career, rather than to be with the Lord *before* his appearing. And to Timothy he says (2 Tim. 4: 6): "The time of my *analusis* [dissolution] is at hand. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown, which the Lord the righteous Judge will give me at *that day:* and not to me only, but unto all them also who love his *appearing.*"

Here again the appearing is the only object of comfort to the apostle. But if he cherished another and more immediate ground of comfort, that of being immediately admitted to Christ's presence at death, why does he not intimate it to his beloved Timothy? Is not his silence to be explained by believing that he knew of no such comfort? but had his confidence (as he had previously said to the Corinthians) in "God, who raiseth the dead," and almost at

the close of this letter to Timothy, the last he ever wrote (2 Tim. 4: 18), he says: "The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and *will preserve* me unto his heavenly kingdom."

Paul knew that the death which was now approaching him was a dissolution of the man, a "returning of the dust to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it;" and hence his trust that God would preserve him unto his heavenly kingdom: and this language clearly indicates that Paul's spirit was with God before Paul was conceived, or born; and, also, that the matter or dust was in the earth before it was organized into the man Paul, and vitalized by the spirit or breath of life: for neither the one nor the other could return to where they had never been. And if Paul possessed no conscious existence previous to his being organized, by what law of logic are we to hold that when he becomes *disorganized* by death he can still retain his consciousness?

The Psalmist, speaking of the beasts (Ps. 104: 29), says: "Thou takest away their spirit [or breath], they die and return to their dust." So God takes away the spirit of the beast, as well as man. But does it therefore follow that because the spirit of life that God only can give to animal as well as man, is said to return to him, or be taken away by him, the being it animated returns too, and lives on, having simply changed one kind of life for another, rather than life for death?

But what does the passage in 2 Cor. 5 mean?

I think ordinary attention to the context would show that the apostle is comparing the present mortal and corruptible condition with the immortal and incorruptible; and earnestly desires the one to replace the other, that, as he expresses it, "mortality might be swallowed up of life." The phraseology the apostle employs when compared with similar language that he elsewhere uses, clearly shows that he is here considering two states, or conditions of being, and *two only:* and that these two are the *temporal* and the *eternal* (ch. 4: 18), not the temporal and the *intermediate*, as my reviewer teaches. "*Not* that we would be unclothed," says Paul. He had no notion of the unclothed or disembodied state that the hymn-books tell us so much about now-a-days; but looked forward to the perfect and eternal state, when the corruptible should have put on incorruption, and the mortal immortality. Then the saying would be brought to pass, "Death is swallowed up of victory!" Or, as he here expresses it, "mor-

tality swallowed up of life." Then should Paul not only be *present* with the Lord, but be ever with him.

I presume my reviewer will admit that the saints who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord will be present *then* with him for the *first* time: and Paul does not expect to be present any sooner; for his own testimony is, "We who are alive and remain shall be caught up *together* with them [the risen ones] to meet the Lord in the air; and so we shall ever be with the Lord."

Another passage cited by my friend in support of his view is 2 Cor. 12: 3:

"Whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth."

Drowning men are said to catch at straws; and perhaps it were cruel to remove such slender support: but unwilling to leave our brother trusting to a broken reed, I would ask him to notice a sentence of the apostle's first letter to the same people, which explains his meaning here.

"For I verily as *absent in body* but *present in spirit* have judged already concerning him that hath done this deed." (1 Cor. 5: 3.)

Now here it is far more clearly taught that it was possible for the apostle to be present *without* his body than in the passage my friend has quoted. But the meaning in the one being so obvious, and giving so little countenance to the idea that he labors to establish, he seizes the other; which we think would be more wisely left in the uncertainty in which the apostle left it, and say, "We cannot tell: God knoweth," rather than deduce from it a doctrine, popular indeed in the Romish as well as the Mohammedan and Pagan world, but unknown, we think, to the Bible: we mean the doctrine that a man can *think* and *act* and *feel* during the time that he is a subject of death.

And now, in conclusion, permit me to say, that the foregoing are my views, as far as I have had room in a single article to state them, on the various subjects treated. And I confidently leave your readers (Bible in hand) to say whether or no they are well founded. I have not adopted them at the *ipse dixit* of any man, but from a careful and prayerful personal study of the word, I have been irresistibly borne to the conclusion that they are the "mind of the Spirit." And whilst aware that we are boldly characterized by some of our friends who maintain popular theology as dishonest and dangerous men, for contending somewhat

earnestly for what we believe to be "the faith once delivered to the saints," we will not nor wish not to retaliate: for experience has convinced us that hard names seldom soften men's prejudices, or convince their judgments. The Christianity that consists in imitating Christ (and no other deserves the name) has taught us a *better* way; and though in this imperfect and mortal state we may never see eye to eye, still we can express our differences in the Master's spirit, and long for the time when gathered from the four winds of heaven we "shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom," and brought by the Almighty arm of a tender Father to our eternal home, we shall go out no more forever.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The terms "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven" are synonymous; and are used interchangeably by the inspired penman. Matthew with few exceptions using the latter, and the other evangelists exclusively the former. It is a fundamental term as used in the Bible, and its definite import is of vast importance to a correct understanding of the Scriptures. But what clear idea can be conceived of it by those who make it to signify the gospel; and the gospel dispensation; a state of grace in the heart; the Christian Church; a spiritual reign of Christ here; and the heavenly world hereafter?

That such a term should be used in a sense so vague, is hardly supposable when we reflect that the writers were Divinely inspired, and speaking of subjects of so grave a nature, as involve the eternal destinies of men. And should not a latitude of interpretation so great awaken of itself serious doubts of its correctness? While its tendency is to destroy all distinctive ideas of the kingdom, it throws wide open the doors for infidelity, and renders quite meaningless the most solemn declarations of the Bible, excluding unrenewed men from the "kingdom of God."

The nearer we can keep to a clear, definite, and literal interpretation of the Bible, the safer we are. A careful examination of all the fulfilled prophecies cannot fail to convince any one of this fact. Take for example those touching the first advent;

UMI

tality swallowed up of life." Then should Paul not only be *present* with the Lord, but be ever with him.

I presume my reviewer will admit that the saints who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord will be present *then* with him for the *first* time: and Paul does not expect to be present any sooner; for his own testimony is, "We who are alive and remain shall be caught up *together* with them [the risen ones] to meet the Lord in the air; and so we shall ever be with the Lord."

Another passage cited by my friend in support of his view is 2 Cor. 12: 3:

"Whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth."

Drowning men are said to catch at straws; and perhaps it were cruel to remove such slender support: but unwilling to leave our brother trusting to a broken reed, I would ask him to notice a sentence of the apostle's first letter to the same people, which explains his meaning here.

"For I verily as *absent in body* but *present in spirit* have judged already concerning him that hath done this deed." (1 Cor. 5: 3.)

Now here it is far more clearly taught that it was possible for the apostle to be present *without* his body than in the passage my friend has quoted. But the meaning in the one being so obvious, and giving so little countenance to the idea that he labors to establish, he seizes the other; which we think would be more wisely left in the uncertainty in which the apostle left it, and say, "We cannot tell: God knoweth," rather than deduce from it a doctrine, popular indeed in the Romish as well as the Mohammedan and Pagan world, but unknown, we think, to the Bible: we mean the doctrine that a man can *think* and *act* and *feel* during the time that he is a subject of death.

And now, in conclusion, permit me to say, that the foregoing are my views, as far as I have had room in a single article to state them, on the various subjects treated. And I confidently leave your readers (Bible in hand) to say whether or no they are well founded. I have not adopted them at the *ipse dixit* of any man, but from a careful and prayerful personal study of the word, I have been irresistibly borne to the conclusion that they are the "mind of the Spirit." And whilst aware that we are boldly characterized by some of our friends who maintain popular theology as dishonest and dangerous men, for contending somewhat

earnestly for what we believe to be "the faith once delivered to the saints," we will not nor wish not to retaliate: for experience has convinced us that hard names seldom soften men's prejudices, or convince their judgments. The Christianity that consists in imitating Christ (and no other deserves the name) has taught us a *better* way; and though in this imperfect and mortal state we may never see eye to eye, still we can express our differences in the Master's spirit, and long for the time when gathered from the four winds of heaven we "shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom," and brought by the Almighty arm of a tender Father to our eternal home, we shall go out no more forever.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The terms "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven" are synonymous; and are used interchangeably by the inspired penman. Matthew with few exceptions using the latter, and the other evangelists exclusively the former. It is a fundamental term as used in the Bible, and its definite import is of vast importance to a correct understanding of the Scriptures. But what clear idea can be conceived of it by those who make it to signify the gospel; and the gospel dispensation; a state of grace in the heart; the Christian Church; a spiritual reign of Christ here; and the heavenly world hereafter?

That such a term should be used in a sense so vague, is hardly supposable when we reflect that the writers were Divinely inspired, and speaking of subjects of so grave a nature, as involve the eternal destinies of men. And should not a latitude of interpretation so great awaken of itself serious doubts of its correctness? While its tendency is to destroy all distinctive ideas of the kingdom, it throws wide open the doors for infidelity, and renders quite meaningless the most solemn declarations of the Bible, excluding unrenewed men from the "kingdom of God."

The nearer we can keep to a clear, definite, and literal interpretation of the Bible, the safer we are. A careful examination of all the fulfilled prophecies cannot fail to convince any one of this fact. Take for example those touching the first advent;

UMI

and did their fulfillment show that any of them were to be understood as mere figures of speech? Did they terminate in anything short of a literal accomplishment, even when of such a nature as would have seemed impossible?

It was predicted that Christ should be born of a virgin; that he should be called out of Egypt; that he should ride upon a colt on which man never sat; that he should be reproached, and afflicted; led as a lamb to the slaughter; be scourged, condemned, and put to death. Yet what a literal fulfillment do we have of these prophecies, as also of all the minute details of his crucifixion, burial, and resurrection!

And if prophecy failed in nothing of a literal fulfillment touching his humiliation, his sufferings, and death, why should it fail of this, pertaining to his glory? If Peter stood terribly rebuked when in reference to his suffering death he said, "This be far from thee, Lord;" may not we also be, should we say the same respecting the literal establishment of his kingdom and reign? If the deep humiliation was kept to the very letter of the word, why not the great exaltation and glory? If to fulfill the prophecy, he shall make "his grave" with "the rich in his death," the Son of God must die, and lay his lifeless form in the dark, cold tomb of Joseph, how shall that prophecy be fulfilled which says, "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David: he will not turn from it: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne?" (Ps. 132: 11.) When "this same Jesus" that was taken up into heaven "shall so come in like manner as he went "into heaven" (Acts 1: 11), and there shall be given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom (Dan. 7: 14), may he not "according to the flesh" (Acts 2: 30), that is as the legal heir, sit upon "the throne of his father David, and reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there be no end?" (Luke 1: 32, 33.)

The latter is predicted with a clearness and precision far exceeding the former, with no intimation but what it will be just as actual. The fact that Christ ascended bodily to heaven "with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature,"[1] that the heavens now retain him, and that he will come again in his glorified humanity, is a fact more than suggestive of an ulterior design yet to be accomplished. Christ will be in his

[1] Meth. Dis., Art. 3.

kingdom bodily: and "if nothing else gave locality to heaven," as Richard Watson says, "this would."

With Christ's kingdom then a locality, and he a king descended from the royal house of David, with the Father's oath giving him David's throne; and his coming, and reign, and kingdom, all synchronizing together, should it not awake an earnest inquiry whether these things are all to culminate in mere figures of speech; or whether when he comes and "swallows up death in victory," he will not personally over the true Israel "reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously?" (Is. 24: 23.)

The term kingdom embraces of necessity the idea of territory, of subjects, and a king. Properly these must all be existing together, or we can have no kingdom. And may we suppose that Christ's kingdom will fail in any of these essential elements? May it not after all be just as real and tangible as other kingdoms, and thus have its literal fulfillment? And does not the term as used in the Scriptures always have reference directly or indirectly to that state of things where Christ shall be personally present with his people reigning over them in everlasting life? Is it not that state of things John saw, when he that sat upon the throne said, "Behold, I make all things new?" (Rev. 21: 5.) "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain." These things used to be, but are now no more; for it is added, "the former things are passed away." A new and everlasting dispensation of things has come. The "kingdom has come," and God's "will is done in earth as it is in heaven."

The kingdom of God as announced by John and Christ was a term readily understood in its main features by their hearers, and needed no word of explanation as something new and before unheard of. The expectation of the Jew that Christ was to establish a kingdom, and be in it personally and reign a king, is not so easily shown to have been an error. That they overlooked his coming first to die, and narrowed their views of his reign down to men in the flesh, was where they stumbled and fell. For the prophets, and Christ, and the apostles all speak of the kingdom of God as being just as real, and visible, as any earth-

and did their fulfillment show that any of them were to be understood as mere figures of speech? Did they terminate in anything short of a literal accomplishment, even when of such a nature as would have seemed impossible?

It was predicted that Christ should be born of a virgin; that he should be called out of Egypt; that he should ride upon a colt on which man never sat; that he should be reproached, and afflicted; led as a lamb to the slaughter; be scourged, condemned, and put to death. Yet what a literal fulfillment do we have of these prophecies, as also of all the minute details of his crucifixion, burial, and resurrection!

And if prophecy failed in nothing of a literal fulfillment touching his humiliation, his sufferings, and death, why should it fail of this, pertaining to his glory? If Peter stood terribly rebuked when in reference to his suffering death he said, "This be far from thee, Lord;" may not we also be, should we say the same respecting the literal establishment of his kingdom and reign? If the deep humiliation was kept to the very letter of the word, why not the great exaltation and glory? If to fulfill the prophecy, he shall make "his grave" with "the rich in his death," the Son of God must die, and lay his lifeless form in the dark, cold tomb of Joseph, how shall that prophecy be fulfilled which says, "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David: he will not turn from it: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne?" (Ps. 132: 11.) When "this same Jesus" that was taken up into heaven "shall so come in like manner as he went "into heaven" (Acts 1: 11), and there shall be given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom (Dan. 7: 14), may he not "according to the flesh" (Acts 2: 30), that is as the legal heir, sit upon "the throne of his father David, and reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there be no end?" (Luke 1: 32, 33.)

The latter is predicted with a clearness and precision far exceeding the former, with no intimation but what it will be just as actual. The fact that Christ ascended bodily to heaven "with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature,"[1] that the heavens now retain him, and that he will come again in his glorified humanity, is a fact more than suggestive of an ulterior design yet to be accomplished. Christ will be in his

[1] Meth. Dis., Art. 3.

kingdom bodily: and "if nothing else gave locality to heaven," as Richard Watson says, "this would."

With Christ's kingdom then a locality, and he a king descended from the royal house of David, with the Father's oath giving him David's throne; and his coming, and reign, and kingdom, all synchronizing together, should it not awake an earnest inquiry whether these things are all to culminate in mere figures of speech; or whether when he comes and "swallows up death in victory," he will not personally over the true Israel "reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously?" (Is. 24: 23.)

The term kingdom embraces of necessity the idea of territory, of subjects, and a king. Properly these must all be existing together, or we can have no kingdom. And may we suppose that Christ's kingdom will fail in any of these essential elements? May it not after all be just as real and tangible as other kingdoms, and thus have its literal fulfillment? And does not the term as used in the Scriptures always have reference directly or indirectly to that state of things where Christ shall be personally present with his people reigning over them in everlasting life? Is it not that state of things John saw, when he that sat upon the throne said, "Behold, I make all things new?" (Rev. 21: 5.) "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain." These things used to be, but are now no more; for it is added, "the former things are passed away." A new and everlasting dispensation of things has come. The "kingdom has come," and God's "will is done in earth as it is in heaven."

The kingdom of God as announced by John and Christ was a term readily understood in its main features by their hearers, and needed no word of explanation as something new and before unheard of. The expectation of the Jew that Christ was to establish a kingdom, and be in it personally and reign a king, is not so easily shown to have been an error. That they overlooked his coming first to die, and narrowed their views of his reign down to men in the flesh, was where they stumbled and fell. For the prophets, and Christ, and the apostles all speak of the kingdom of God as being just as real, and visible, as any earth-

ly kingdom, and as to succeed all other kingdoms, being established over all the earth in an immortal state; Christ its king, the redeemed of all ages its subjects, and the world renewed its territory. This I understand to be the definite import of the term "kingdom of God."

When John and Christ preached, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand," it certainly could have had no force, and no meaning to the minds of their hearers, unless it harmonized with the teachings of the Jewish Scriptures. Much less could a doctrine new, and unexplained, have been urged as the ground of immediate repentance and faith. And as the very terms they used were those employed by the prophet Daniel, it seems unreasonable to suppose the kingdom to be any other than Daniel's fifth monarchy; called the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven, because the God of heaven sets it up.

Now to suppose this kingdom is the gospel, or gospel dispensation, is to mistake the shadow for the substance, and fall utterly short both of the spirit and letter of the word of God. Christ was wont to call the gospel "this gospel of the kingdom." Literally the good news of the kingdom. He preached "the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye therefore and believe the gospel;" believe this "good news." But the good news of a thing cannot be the thing itself. And if we confound them, do we not err?

Again, if the gospel be the kingdom, what motive could be drawn from its being at hand why men should repent now? an idea at once involving the assurance that a time more favorable for repentance than the present was to come. Elsewhere the Savior directly urges repentance and faith on the ground of eternal salvation or damnation. "Repent, or ye shall all likewise perish;" he that believeth not shall be damned. Paul urges the same motive when he says, "But God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." And repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand, must have involved in it the same idea. And this idea we have when we admit that it means not the gospel, but the kingdom of God to come, in an immortal state. To enter this kingdom a man must "repent," must "be converted" and become as a little child; and he "must be born again."

But further, how could the kingdom mean the gospel? for it

is an undeniable fact that the Gospel had already come. Christ himself testifies: "The law and the prophets were until John," no longer; "since that time the kingdom of God is preached." Is preached subjectively. The preaching being itself the gospel, and the kingdom the subject of its proclamation.

These considerations certainly should settle the fact, that the gospel and the kingdom are two very distinct things. The one is the good news of the other. The one warns us to repent and prepare for the other. The one shows us what we must do, and what we must be, ever to enter the other.

In the prophecy of Daniel (ch. 2: 31–35) we have the monarchies of this world—and in them its history—symbolized by a great image, whose head of gold dated back to near the flood, and whose feet and toes of clay and iron reach onward to the end of all worldly kingdoms. Thus spanning by his prophetic form their entire duration—the whole of this present state of things—and to be followed in their utter overthrow by another kingdom, called the kingdom of God.

Now does this fifth kingdom have its fulfillment in the gospel dispensation? A strong argument might be drawn from Scriptural analogy that would lead us to conclude not. Three grand historic periods, or marked stages of existence called "worlds," are assigned in the Bible to our earth.

We have "the heavens and the earth before the flood," called "*the world* that then was." In that world there appear to have been no kingdoms. Men were sinners exceedingly, and its termination was marked by physical changes, involving its wicked inhabitants in utter destruction. God destroyed it with a flood of waters.

Then comes the present *world*, "the heavens and earth which are now." These the apostle tells us are "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men.' (1 Pet. 3: 7.) The present world is a world of kingdoms; and the image spans their entire duration. The destruction of the image symbolizes the destruction of these kingdoms, which will only be in the destruction of this world. This will bring us to the kingdom of God; the "*world to come;*" the "new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

A careful examination of the whole prophecy should convince the earnest seeker after truth, that nothing short of earth's closing scenes are here brought to view. If the "stone cut out of

ly kingdom, and as to succeed all other kingdoms, being established over all the earth in an immortal state; Christ its king, the redeemed of all ages its subjects, and the world renewed its territory. This I understand to be the definite import of the term "kingdom of God."

When John and Christ preached, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand," it certainly could have had no force, and no meaning to the minds of their hearers, unless it harmonized with the teachings of the Jewish Scriptures. Much less could a doctrine new, and unexplained, have been urged as the ground of immediate repentance and faith. And as the very terms they used were those employed by the prophet Daniel, it seems unreasonable to suppose the kingdom to be any other than Daniel's fifth monarchy; called the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven, because the God of heaven sets it up.

Now to suppose this kingdom is the gospel, or gospel dispensation, is to mistake the shadow for the substance, and fall utterly short both of the spirit and letter of the word of God. Christ was wont to call the gospel "this gospel of the kingdom." Literally the good news of the kingdom. He preached "the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye therefore and believe the gospel;" believe this "good news." But the good news of a thing cannot be the thing itself. And if we confound them, do we not err?

Again, if the gospel be the kingdom, what motive could be drawn from its being at hand why men should repent now? an idea at once involving the assurance that a time more favorable for repentance than the present was to come. Elsewhere the Savior directly urges repentance and faith on the ground of eternal salvation or damnation. "Repent, or ye shall all likewise perish;" he that believeth not shall be damned. Paul urges the same motive when he says, "But God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." And repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand, must have involved in it the same idea. And this idea we have when we admit that it means not the gospel, but the kingdom of God to come, in an immortal state. To enter this kingdom a man must "repent," must "be converted" and become as a little child; and he "must be born again."

But further, how could the kingdom mean the gospel? for it

is an undeniable fact that the Gospel had already come. Christ himself testifies: "The law and the prophets were until John," no longer; "since that time the kingdom of God is preached." Is preached subjectively. The preaching being itself the gospel, and the kingdom the subject of its proclamation.

These considerations certainly should settle the fact, that the gospel and the kingdom are two very distinct things. The one is the good news of the other. The one warns us to repent and prepare for the other. The one shows us what we must do, and what we must be, ever to enter the other.

In the prophecy of Daniel (ch. 2: 31–35) we have the monarchies of this world—and in them its history—symbolized by a great image, whose head of gold dated back to near the flood, and whose feet and toes of clay and iron reach onward to the end of all worldly kingdoms. Thus spanning by his prophetic form their entire duration—the whole of this present state of things—and to be followed in their utter overthrow by another kingdom, called the kingdom of God.

Now does this fifth kingdom have its fulfillment in the gospel dispensation? A strong argument might be drawn from Scriptural analogy that would lead us to conclude not. Three grand historic periods, or marked stages of existence called "worlds," are assigned in the Bible to our earth.

We have "the heavens and the earth before the flood," called "*the world* that then was." In that world there appear to have been no kingdoms. Men were sinners exceedingly, and its termination was marked by physical changes, involving its wicked inhabitants in utter destruction. God destroyed it with a flood of waters.

Then comes the present *world*, "the heavens and earth which are now." These the apostle tells us are "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men.' (1 Pet. 3: 7.) The present world is a world of kingdoms; and the image spans their entire duration. The destruction of the image symbolizes the destruction of these kingdoms, which will only be in the destruction of this world. This will bring us to the kingdom of God; the "*world to come;*" the "new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

A careful examination of the whole prophecy should convince the earnest seeker after truth, that nothing short of earth's closing scenes are here brought to view. If the "stone cut out of

the mountain without hands," which destroyed this image, had been Christ in his first advent, should not the specified point of contact with the image have been very different? Both prophetic truth and historic fact required—if the gospel be meant by the stone—that the point of contact designated should have been the legs of the image. Here was the exact time in which Christ first came. Rome was then in the glory of her iron age; and never stronger than when she issued her "decree, that all the world should be taxed." And before we reach the feet of the image, this whole empire in its undivided form became nominally a Christian empire. And yet the prophet declares that the "stone smote the image upon his feet." Was he mistaken? or are our modern theologians? Hence I affirm that the gospel dispensation, in any form, cannot be the event the prophet here predicts.

The feet and toes of the image, part of potter's clay and part of iron, represent the nations as they have been since the breaking up of the Roman empire. The prophet carries us on in the history of the world, down past the legs of iron, to the very feet and toes of the image. And it is not until we arrive here that the "stone" smites the image at all. And when it does it "smites the image upon his feet." And that God meant just this exactly, is made certain by the very definite manner of its being stated; "*upon his feet*," says the prophet, "*which were of iron*, and *clay*." There was no clay in the legs, and no feet until long after the first advent: the image existing only in the developments of history. As such it is represented as standing in all the glory of its successive reigns, living out its day undisturbed, until suddenly it is smitten, utterly destroyed, and swept from the face of the earth.

There is no two thousand years presented here of weary grinding away at this image with but comparative results. No "little stone" described as "rolling gradually onward and onward, increasing and increasing, more and more, until at last it becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth." When this kingdom of the stone comes, it smites the image with terrible and irresistible power. The whole scene is changed as in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. The kingdoms of this world are broken to pieces together, and become as the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carries them away that no

place is found for them. Then it is that the kingdom of God is established under the whole heaven and fills the whole earth.

The interpretation of the vision by the prophet presents us with the same leading ideas. "And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided." These divisions were to "mingle themselves with the seed of men"—be scattered over the earth—"and cleave not one to another," or become again a consolidated monarchy. "And in the days of these kings," or kingdoms, the very ones resulting from the divisions of the Roman Empire, and now existing upon the earth as shadowed forth by the toes of the image, "shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom."

Nothing can be made plainer, than that the prophet carries us down the stream of time to the world as it now is, with its varied dynasties, and having brought us here, and as standing in our midst he says, "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Something entirely new and manifestly different from what ever has been. "And it shall not be left to other people." Can this be said of a kingdom where death is? Nay. "It shall not be left to other people."

"Life from the dead is in that word,
'Tis immortality."

"It shall stand forever," the same kingdom, the same people, "forever with the Lord."

But not only does the chronology of the event determine its character, but also the manner of its accomplishment. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet which were of iron and clay and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors. And the wind carried them away that no place was found for them." The interpretation says, "shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and shall stand forever." Now does such language as this imply the conversion of men to God? Does it indicate the gracious drawings, and melting influences of the gospel, and the grace of God upon the human heart, by which the sinner is won to Christ?

But further, does the spread of the gospel in the world brake in pieces and destroy human governments? Does all history give us one solitary example? Rather are not human governments

the mountain without hands," which destroyed this image, had been Christ in his first advent, should not the specified point of contact with the image have been very different? Both prophetic truth and historic fact required—if the gospel be meant by the stone—that the point of contact designated should have been the legs of the image. Here was the exact time in which Christ first came. Rome was then in the glory of her iron age; and never stronger than when she issued her "decree, that all the world should be taxed." And before we reach the feet of the image, this whole empire in its undivided form became nominally a Christian empire. And yet the prophet declares that the "stone smote the image upon his feet." Was he mistaken? or are our modern theologians? Hence I affirm that the gospel dispensation, in any form, cannot be the event the prophet here predicts.

The feet and toes of the image, part of potter's clay and part of iron, represent the nations as they have been since the breaking up of the Roman empire. The prophet carries us on in the history of the world, down past the legs of iron, to the very feet and toes of the image. And it is not until we arrive here that the "stone" smites the image at all. And when it does it "smites the image upon his feet." And that God meant just this exactly, is made certain by the very definite manner of its being stated; "*upon his feet*," says the prophet, "*which were of iron*, and *clay*." There was no clay in the legs, and no feet until long after the first advent: the image existing only in the developments of history. As such it is represented as standing in all the glory of its successive reigns, living out its day undisturbed, until suddenly it is smitten, utterly destroyed, and swept from the face of the earth.

There is no two thousand years presented here of weary grinding away at this image with but comparative results. No "little stone" described as "rolling gradually onward and onward, increasing and increasing, more and more, until at last it becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth." When this kingdom of the stone comes, it smites the image with terrible and irresistible power. The whole scene is changed as in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. The kingdoms of this world are broken to pieces together, and become as the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carries them away that no

place is found for them. Then it is that the kingdom of God is established under the whole heaven and fills the whole earth.

The interpretation of the vision by the prophet presents us with the same leading ideas. "And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided." These divisions were to "mingle themselves with the seed of men"—be scattered over the earth—"and cleave not one to another," or become again a consolidated monarchy. "And in the days of these kings," or kingdoms, the very ones resulting from the divisions of the Roman Empire, and now existing upon the earth as shadowed forth by the toes of the image, "shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom."

Nothing can be made plainer, than that the prophet carries us down the stream of time to the world as it now is, with its varied dynasties, and having brought us here, and as standing in our midst he says, "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Something entirely new and manifestly different from what ever has been. "And it shall not be left to other people." Can this be said of a kingdom where death is? Nay. "It shall not be left to other people."

"Life from the dead is in that word,
'Tis immortality."

"It shall stand forever," the same kingdom, the same people, "forever with the Lord."

But not only does the chronology of the event determine its character, but also the manner of its accomplishment. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet which were of iron and clay and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors. And the wind carried them away that no place was found for them." The interpretation says, "shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and shall stand forever." Now does such language as this imply the conversion of men to God? Does it indicate the gracious drawings, and melting influences of the gospel, and the grace of God upon the human heart, by which the sinner is won to Christ?

But further, does the spread of the gospel in the world brake in pieces and destroy human governments? Does all history give us one solitary example? Rather are not human governments

cemented and strengthened by the intelligence and virtue implanted, and the loyalty imposed by the gospel? And do we not as a nation to-day owe our salvation under God directly to that love of country and right which the gospel would implant in every human heart? Hence we say the event here predicted does not indicate the progress of the gospel in the world.

But it does indicate the final judgment-day; the judgment of God upon the wicked, in the end of the world. They are the "chaff which the wind driveth away." "The wicked shall be driven away in his wickedness." And when Christ comes and gathers the wheat into the garner, he "burns up the chaff with unquenchable fire." And can we reasonably suppose that any other event will ever make an end of all human governments, as Daniel positively predicts there will be, when this kingdom shall be revealed? Most certainly not. Such a view would stand opposed to all present ideas of men.

But the prophet does not leave us here. In the seventh chapter we have the same history presented, only more fully, by four great beasts which came up out of the sea. The last beast has ten horns denoting the divisions of the fourth kingdom, the same as the feet and toes of clay and iron in the image; with yet another horn, denoting the Papal power. This view is sanctioned by every Protestant writer of any note. And what is the character or nature of the kingdom brought to view here? Does not its ushering in harmonize precisely with the judgment-day in other Scriptures? We have the same grand Assize as presented by Christ and John, in the New Testament. It perfectly harmonizes in all its leading features, its details, and its results. We have alike Christ coming in the clouds of heaven, the judge, and the throne; the vast ministering and attending host; the innumerable multitudes arraigned before the judge; the opening of the books, and the awarding of each and all according to their works. The righteous inherit a kingdom, and the wicked are consigned to the burning flame.

And these adjudications are presented as final and eternal. The saints it is said "shall possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever" (Dan. 7: 18); and the wicked are consigned to shame and everlasting contempt. (Dan. 12: 2.)

The saints here are not either ordinary saints in the flesh. Dr. Clarke says the original "signifies pre-eminent saints," or rather "the holy ones." They are in the kingdom of God, and flesh and blood cannot inherit it. They are the resurrection saints. They are those whom the angel tells us in the interpretation of the vision "sleep in the dust of the earth"—the saints of all ages—"that awake to everlasting life, and shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever."

The kingdom in the seventh chapter corresponds to the same in the second: Christ coming in the clouds of heaven, to the "stone" cut out without hands; and the destruction of the image and the beast, the one driven away as the chaff, and the other given to the burning flame, is all in perfect harmony with the judgment-day of the New Testament. Now to claim that such terms are employed to indicate the conversion of men to God and the spread of the gospel in the world, certainly presents a very strange anomaly in Scriptural exegesis. Hereafter when we read in the New Testament of Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven, and in "flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel;" that "every eye shall see him" and the wicked "wail because of him," crying to the "rocks fall on us, and to the hills cover us," we have only to understand that Christ and Paul and John are borrowing some of Daniel's impressive figures, to show how the sweet and melting influences of the gospel will yet subdue and win the hearts of men from the world and sin to the Savior!

But such is the absurdity of this, that we are compelled to believe that Daniel just the same as Christ and Paul and John is predicting a kingdom in an immortal state. Their testimony is a unit. The witnesses all agree as touching this very thing. Daniel has Christ coming in the "clouds of heaven," the "judgment," and "the kingdom." Paul says "he shall *judge* the quick and dead, at his *appearing* and *kingdom*." The Savior tells us that in the end of this world, he will "gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity, and cast them into a furnace of fire: . . . . . then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." And when "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ," at the same time, John tells us, "the time of the dead comes" that "they should be judged," and rewarded. (Rev. 11: 15–18.) And is there not agreement here?

THE KINGDOM "AT HAND."

But if such be the nature of the kingdom, how could it be said

cemented and strengthened by the intelligence and virtue implanted, and the loyalty imposed by the gospel? And do we not as a nation to-day owe our salvation under God directly to that love of country and right which the gospel would implant in every human heart? Hence we say the event here predicted does not indicate the progress of the gospel in the world.

But it does indicate the final judgment-day; the judgment of God upon the wicked, in the end of the world. They are the "chaff which the wind driveth away." "The wicked shall be driven away in his wickedness." And when Christ comes and gathers the wheat into the garner, he "burns up the chaff with unquenchable fire." And can we reasonably suppose that any other event will ever make an end of all human governments, as Daniel positively predicts there will be, when this kingdom shall be revealed? Most certainly not. Such a view would stand opposed to all present ideas of men.

But the prophet does not leave us here. In the seventh chapter we have the same history presented, only more fully, by four great beasts which came up out of the sea. The last beast has ten horns denoting the divisions of the fourth kingdom, the same as the feet and toes of clay and iron in the image; with yet another horn, denoting the Papal power. This view is sanctioned by every Protestant writer of any note. And what is the character or nature of the kingdom brought to view here? Does not its ushering in harmonize precisely with the judgment-day in other Scriptures? We have the same grand Assize as presented by Christ and John, in the New Testament. It perfectly harmonizes in all its leading features, its details, and its results. We have alike Christ coming in the clouds of heaven, the judge, and the throne; the vast ministering and attending host; the innumerable multitudes arraigned before the judge; the opening of the books, and the awarding of each and all according to their works. The righteous inherit a kingdom, and the wicked are consigned to the burning flame.

And these adjudications are presented as final and eternal. The saints it is said "shall possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever" (Dan. 7: 18); and the wicked are consigned to shame and everlasting contempt. (Dan. 12: 2.)

The saints here are not either ordinary saints in the flesh. Dr. Clarke says the original "signifies pre-eminent saints," or rather "the holy ones." They are in the kingdom of God, and flesh and blood cannot inherit it. They are the resurrection saints. They are those whom the angel tells us in the interpretation of the vision "sleep in the dust of the earth"—the saints of all ages—"that awake to everlasting life, and shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever."

The kingdom in the seventh chapter corresponds to the same in the second: Christ coming in the clouds of heaven, to the "stone" cut out without hands; and the destruction of the image and the beast, the one driven away as the chaff, and the other given to the burning flame, is all in perfect harmony with the judgment-day of the New Testament. Now to claim that such terms are employed to indicate the conversion of men to God and the spread of the gospel in the world, certainly presents a very strange anomaly in Scriptural exegesis. Hereafter when we read in the New Testament of Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven, and in "flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel;" that "every eye shall see him" and the wicked "wail because of him," crying to the "rocks fall on us, and to the hills cover us," we have only to understand that Christ and Paul and John are borrowing some of Daniel's impressive figures, to show how the sweet and melting influences of the gospel will yet subdue and win the hearts of men from the world and sin to the Savior!

But such is the absurdity of this, that we are compelled to believe that Daniel just the same as Christ and Paul and John is predicting a kingdom in an immortal state. Their testimony is a unit. The witnesses all agree as touching this very thing. Daniel has Christ coming in the "clouds of heaven," the "judgment," and "the kingdom." Paul says "he shall *judge* the quick and dead, at his *appearing* and *kingdom*." The Savior tells us that in the end of this world, he will "gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity, and cast them into a furnace of fire: . . . . . then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." And when "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ," at the same time, John tells us, "the time of the dead comes" that "they should be judged," and rewarded. (Rev. 11: 15–18.) And is there not agreement here?

THE KINGDOM "AT HAND."

But if such be the nature of the kingdom, how could it be said

to have been "at hand" by Christ and the apostles in their day? "At hand" is a term that may have a greater or less latitude of meaning, according to the greatness or uncommonness of the event to which it is applied. While with no propriety could it be said of a clock, "The time of its striking is at hand," though but thirty minutes might yet be wanting; we could very justly say of a young man that "the time of his majority is at hand," though several years might still be lacking of the event.

That our Savior used the term in its broader import is proved from the fact that he distinguishes between its use as "*at hand*" and "*nigh at hand.*" When his coming should approach within the circle of a generation, he changes the form of expression, and tells us by the given signs to know that the kingdom of God is *nigh at hand*, even at the doors. (Luke 21: 31; Matt. 24: 33.)

In the broader sense, the kingdom of God was "at hand" in the series of events or kingdoms. God had shown by the prophet Daniel that four great universal monarchies should arise, and rule over the earth. That these should all be swept away and give place to a fifth called the kingdom of God, that should be "set up" and "stand forever." When then three of these had arisen and had their day, and the fourth had come and reached its zenith of power and glory, what was the next great monarchy "at hand?" Was it not the fifth, the kingdom of God? And did it not become the king elect then standing in the midst of these rebellious rulers, to utter in their ears the warning voice, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand?" "Be wise, O ye kings, and be instructed ye judges of the earth, kiss the son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little." For it is written "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." (Ps. 2: 8–12.)

But again the kingdom was "at hand" in reference to the different dispensations and ages of the world. Paul clearly teaches us in the fourth of Hebrews, that the Sabbath is typical of "the rest that remaineth to the people of God." This would carry along with it the idea that the creation days symbolized the periods during which Christ would be perfecting the work of human redemption, preparatory to the eternal Sabbath of rest. And with the same propriety that it may be said on Friday that we are in the last days of the week, that the Sabbath is at hand, it was declared of the gospel days that they were "the last days," and that "the kingdom of God," and "the end of all things," was "at hand."

Now that our Savior used it in this sense instead of its being at hand in reference to the lives of them that heard him, is evident from the fact that when some were led to believe that his kingdom should immediately appear, he corrected the error. But how did he do it? Did he do it by telling them that they altogether misunderstood the nature of his kingdom? that it was not an actual kingdom in which he personally would be present and reign; but simply a reign of grace in the hearts of believers; a spiritual kingdom consisting in the spread of the gospel in the world and a yielding of the hearts of men to its claims? Nay, verily. But he confirmed that very idea of the personality of his reign which they entertained, by an illustration, that most positively teaches it.

He spake this parable because they thought the kingdom of God should immediately appear. (Luke 19: 11.) A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. He gave ten pounds to his servants, saying, Occupy till I come. But his citizens hated him and sent a message after him saying, We will not have this man to reign over us. And it came to pass when he was returned, having received the kingdom, that he calls those servants and reckons with them. And those mine enemies, he says, who would not that I should reign over them, bring them here and slay them before me.

Now when did this nobleman establish his kingdom, and commence his reign? Was it when he was gone to receive his kingdom? or was it when he had returned having received his kingdom and overthrown his enemies? And in this order of events do not Christ and Daniel agree? Why then should we look for a kingdom in any form before the returning king?

SOME OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

It is objected that there are texts that do teach, that Christ's kingdom has already been established. I will examine those most relied upon and see if they really thus affirm.

"Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here that shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom;" or "shall see the kingdom of God come with power." (Matt. 16: 28; Mark 9: 1.)

UMI

to have been "at hand" by Christ and the apostles in their day? "At hand" is a term that may have a greater or less latitude of meaning, according to the greatness or uncommonness of the event to which it is applied. While with no propriety could it be said of a clock, "The time of its striking is at hand," though but thirty minutes might yet be wanting; we could very justly say of a young man that "the time of his majority is at hand," though several years might still be lacking of the event.

That our Savior used the term in its broader import is proved from the fact that he distinguishes between its use as "*at hand*" and "*nigh at hand.*" When his coming should approach within the circle of a generation, he changes the form of expression, and tells us by the given signs to know that the kingdom of God is *nigh at hand*, even at the doors. (Luke 21: 31; Matt. 24: 33.)

In the broader sense, the kingdom of God was "at hand" in the series of events or kingdoms. God had shown by the prophet Daniel that four great universal monarchies should arise, and rule over the earth. That these should all be swept away and give place to a fifth called the kingdom of God, that should be "set up" and "stand forever." When then three of these had arisen and had their day, and the fourth had come and reached its zenith of power and glory, what was the next great monarchy "at hand?" Was it not the fifth, the kingdom of God? And did it not become the king elect then standing in the midst of these rebellious rulers, to utter in their ears the warning voice, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand?" "Be wise, O ye kings, and be instructed ye judges of the earth, kiss the son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little." For it is written "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." (Ps. 2: 8–12.)

But again the kingdom was "at hand" in reference to the different dispensations and ages of the world. Paul clearly teaches us in the fourth of Hebrews, that the Sabbath is typical of "the rest that remaineth to the people of God." This would carry along with it the idea that the creation days symbolized the periods during which Christ would be perfecting the work of human redemption, preparatory to the eternal Sabbath of rest. And with the same propriety that it may be said on Friday that we are in the last days of the week, that the Sabbath is at hand, it was declared of the gospel days that they were "the last days," and that "the kingdom of God," and "the end of all things," was "at hand."

Now that our Savior used it in this sense instead of its being at hand in reference to the lives of them that heard him, is evident from the fact that when some were led to believe that his kingdom should immediately appear, he corrected the error. But how did he do it? Did he do it by telling them that they altogether misunderstood the nature of his kingdom? that it was not an actual kingdom in which he personally would be present and reign; but simply a reign of grace in the hearts of believers; a spiritual kingdom consisting in the spread of the gospel in the world and a yielding of the hearts of men to its claims? Nay, verily. But he confirmed that very idea of the personality of his reign which they entertained, by an illustration, that most positively teaches it.

He spake this parable because they thought the kingdom of God should immediately appear. (Luke 19: 11.) A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. He gave ten pounds to his servants, saying, Occupy till I come. But his citizens hated him and sent a message after him saying, We will not have this man to reign over us. And it came to pass when he was returned, having received the kingdom, that he calls those servants and reckons with them. And those mine enemies, he says, who would not that I should reign over them, bring them here and slay them before me.

Now when did this nobleman establish his kingdom, and commence his reign? Was it when he was gone to receive his kingdom? or was it when he had returned having received his kingdom and overthrown his enemies? And in this order of events do not Christ and Daniel agree? Why then should we look for a kingdom in any form before the returning king?

SOME OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

It is objected that there are texts that do teach, that Christ's kingdom has already been established. I will examine those most relied upon and see if they really thus affirm.

"Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here that shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom;" or "shall see the kingdom of God come with power." (Matt. 16: 28; Mark 9: 1.)

UMI

Few texts have been more generally misapplied or misunderstood than this. It is looked upon as proof positive, by many, that Christ's kingdom must have been set up during the lifetime of certain who then heard him. And they have cast about them to find the kingdom. They discover, that as Christ reigns in the hearts of believers, that this is the kingdom. But if this be so, did not Abel who had the "witness that he was righteous," and Enoch also who for three hundred years walked with God—having "this testimony, that he pleased him"—have the kingdom in them just as much as we?

"But the gospel is the kingdom," says one. But does not Paul tell us that God "preached the gospel before unto Abraham?" And that to the Israelites "was the gospel preached as well as unto us?" And does not the whole Christian Church admit that the covenant made with Abraham and the gospel covenant, are one and the same covenant? Where then does the kingdom come in? "Ah, but the kingdom is spiritual, and invisible, is not to be seen." But does not this falsify the text which declares, "it shall be seen?"

Three of the Evangelists quote this text; and in every case they proceed at once to give an account of the Transfiguration, as though this had something to do with its fulfillment. Not as a full and final accomplishment of the prophecy, but as a gracious and incontestable proof that Christ was the true Messiah, and that his coming and kingdom were no cunningly devised fable. The Savior here had been telling his disciples, that they could not be his, unless they forsook all, took up their cross, and followed him. He assures them that if they lost their lives for his sake they should find them again. But if for the present world they rejected him, they would lose all in the end. "And what," he asks them, "shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul:" "for the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works." Then comes in the text.

Now for the disciples to trust in Christ who stood among them as a man; to trust in him who had been born among them and grown up with them, as being in very deed the Son of God who should sit in final judgment on them and on the world, required no common evidence. Not only was this life, but eternal life involved in the question of his being, or not being a deceiver.

This evidence Christ assures them they shall have; and it is this evidence the text promises.

Right upon this we have the scene of the Transfiguration. His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. Moses and Elias appeared with him in glory, and *he was seen* by the three disciples as in a "vision" "coming in his kingdom." In this "vision" (Matt. 17: 9) he was seen by them as he will be seen by all men, when he shall come to judge the world, and set up his kingdom.

Peter, who saw this, tells us, that Christ's coming is no cunningly devised fable. But why may it not be? Where is the proof? He points us directly to the Transfiguration, as proof positive. "We have not followed cunningly devised fables," he says, "when we made known unto you the *power* and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty—a kingly term and title. For he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." (2 Pet. 1: 16–18.)

The disciples here saw Christ coming in his kingdom in miniature. They saw him, but with the living reality, as we see our friends in the photograph. And they looked upon it as certain proof of his final coming in the end of the world. And they bore witness of this truth, to the end of their lives. "Behold," says John, "he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him." "The day of the Lord," says Peter, "will come as a thief in the night." "Be patient, brethren," says James, "unto the coming of the Lord, ... for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

"For behold the kingdom of God is within you." (Luke 17: 21.)

This is a text often quoted to prove that Christ's kingdom is spiritual, and exists in the hearts of men. It is hardly supposable, however, that our Savior in one breath would tell these Pharisees, "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you," and that "they were of their father the devil," and call them "serpents and a generation of vipers," and in the next tell them that the kingdom of God was in them! Neither are we to understand our Savior as uttering a general truth as to the location of the kingdom of God. The whole question is made to turn upon the manner of its coming. The marginal reading is, "among you,"

Few texts have been more generally misapplied or misunderstood than this. It is looked upon as proof positive, by many, that Christ's kingdom must have been set up during the lifetime of certain who then heard him. And they have cast about them to find the kingdom. They discover, that as Christ reigns in the hearts of believers, that this is the kingdom. But if this be so, did not Abel who had the "witness that he was righteous," and Enoch also who for three hundred years walked with God—having "this testimony, that he pleased him"—have the kingdom in them just as much as we?

"But the gospel is the kingdom," says one. But does not Paul tell us that God "preached the gospel before unto Abraham?" And that to the Israelites "was the gospel preached as well as unto us?" And does not the whole Christian Church admit that the covenant made with Abraham and the gospel covenant, are one and the same covenant? Where then does the kingdom come in? "Ah, but the kingdom is spiritual, and invisible, is not to be seen." But does not this falsify the text which declares, "it shall be seen?"

Three of the Evangelists quote this text; and in every case they proceed at once to give an account of the Transfiguration, as though this had something to do with its fulfillment. Not as a full and final accomplishment of the prophecy, but as a gracious and incontestable proof that Christ was the true Messiah, and that his coming and kingdom were no cunningly devised fable. The Savior here had been telling his disciples, that they could not be his, unless they forsook all, took up their cross, and followed him. He assures them that if they lost their lives for his sake they should find them again. But if for the present world they rejected him, they would lose all in the end. "And what," he asks them, "shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul:" "for the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works." Then comes in the text.

Now for the disciples to trust in Christ who stood among them as a man; to trust in him who had been born among them and grown up with them, as being in very deed the Son of God who should sit in final judgment on them and on the world, required no common evidence. Not only was this life, but eternal life involved in the question of his being, or not being a deceiver.

This evidence Christ assures them they shall have; and it is this evidence the text promises.

Right upon this we have the scene of the Transfiguration. His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. Moses and Elias appeared with him in glory, and *he was seen* by the three disciples as in a "vision" "coming in his kingdom." In this "vision" (Matt. 17: 9) he was seen by them as he will be seen by all men, when he shall come to judge the world, and set up his kingdom.

Peter, who saw this, tells us, that Christ's coming is no cunningly devised fable. But why may it not be? Where is the proof? He points us directly to the Transfiguration, as proof positive. "We have not followed cunningly devised fables," he says, "when we made known unto you the *power* and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty—a kingly term and title. For he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." (2 Pet. 1: 16–18.)

The disciples here saw Christ coming in his kingdom in miniature. They saw him, but with the living reality, as we see our friends in the photograph. And they looked upon it as certain proof of his final coming in the end of the world. And they bore witness of this truth, to the end of their lives. "Behold," says John, "he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him." "The day of the Lord," says Peter, "will come as a thief in the night." "Be patient, brethren," says James, "unto the coming of the Lord, ... for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

"For behold the kingdom of God is within you." (Luke 17: 21.)

This is a text often quoted to prove that Christ's kingdom is spiritual, and exists in the hearts of men. It is hardly supposable, however, that our Savior in one breath would tell these Pharisees, "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you," and that "they were of their father the devil," and call them "serpents and a generation of vipers," and in the next tell them that the kingdom of God was in them! Neither are we to understand our Savior as uttering a general truth as to the location of the kingdom of God. The whole question is made to turn upon the manner of its coming. The marginal reading is, "among you,"

not "in you." This gives it a very different meaning. The Pharisees demanded of Christ no doubt derisively "when the kingdom of God should come." The Savior's reply shows that when it comes all will know it. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say lo here! or lo there!" And turning to his disciples he says, "the days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man"—the same as the kingdom—"and shall not see it. And they shall say to you see here, or see there"—is the kingdom—"go not after them, nor follow them; for as the lightning that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall also the Son of man be in his day." So shall the kingdom of God come. It will come suddenly, and manifestly to all as the lightning from heaven. When it comes it will be among you like the lightning; and all will know it without a "lo here!" or a "lo there!"

"My kingdom is not of this world." (John 18: 36.)

This text is triumphantly quoted by many to prove that Christ's kingdom now exists in the earth, but that it is spiritual, and invisible, only seen in the spread of the gospel in the world.

Now we must aver that this is not the meaning here of Jesus Christ. His kingdom is not of this world, inasmuch as it is not a worldly kingdom, but really a heavenly one. It is not of this world or age, but of the world or age to come. He says, "but now is my kingdom not from hence." That is it is not from this place or from this time, as would be the fact did it exist in this dispensation, in anything more than a preparatory state of formation.

The Jews accused Christ to Pilate of claiming to be a king. "We found this fellow," say they, "forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ, a king." When questioned by Pilate he denied not, but as Paul says "witnessed a good confession" to this very title—"*Thou sayest* that I am a king." To the high priest he says: "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." Daniel says: I saw "one like the son of man," and "he came with the clouds of heaven," and "there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom;" not of this world, but in the end of this world, heavenly and immortal.

Dr. Clarke quotes from Eusebius on this text, that "the relatives of our Lord were brought before Domitian, and interrogated whether they were of the family of David; and what the kingdom of Christ was and when it would appear. "They answered that "his kingdom was heavenly and angelical, and that it would not take place till the end of the world." They did not understand that his kingdom had already come, neither should we. The Scriptures intimate no such idea; but make his coming and kingdom synchronize together; and they are chronologically fixed by the inspired penman to take place in the end of this world, in connection with the resurrection and the judgment.

"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14: 17.)

This text, though usually interpreted otherwise, is in perfect harmony with the idea of a future kingdom. Righteousness, peace, and joy are elements of the kingdom; but do not of themselves alone constitute the kingdom. Just as when it is said "God is love;" love is an element of the divine character, but of itself is not God. No one mistakes here; why should they of the meaning of the text? It is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" that will constitute the bliss of the kingdom, even as their own poets have sung—

"To dwell with God, to taste his love,
Is the full heaven enjoyed above."

"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. 1: 13.)

This text is most evidently a prolepsis. God often "calls things that are not as though they were." Thus God said to Abaaham, "I have made thee a father of many nations," when as yet he had not a son to his name. And so Isaiah spoke of the coming Redeemer: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given," though ages were to intervene before its fulfillment. And in the text those who have a meetness for the heavenly inheritance, are spoken of as having already entered upon it. Hence it is said, that "whom he justified, them he also glorified." But are all the justified saints glorified? They are just as near to that state, as they are to being in the kingdom. Again it is said, "and to wait for his Son from heaven, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." The wrath to come is the wrath of the judgment-day. The deliverance spoken of must be

UMI

not "in you." This gives it a very different meaning. The Pharisees demanded of Christ no doubt derisively "when the kingdom of God should come." The Savior's reply shows that when it comes all will know it. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say lo here! or lo there!" And turning to his disciples he says, "the days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man"—the same as the kingdom—"and shall not see it. And they shall say to you see here, or see there"—is the kingdom—"go not after them, nor follow them; for as the lightning that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall also the Son of man be in his day." So shall the kingdom of God come. It will come suddenly, and manifestly to all as the lightning from heaven. When it comes it will be among you like the lightning; and all will know it without a "lo here!" or a "lo there!"

"My kingdom is not of this world." (John 18: 36.)

This text is triumphantly quoted by many to prove that Christ's kingdom now exists in the earth, but that it is spiritual, and invisible, only seen in the spread of the gospel in the world.

Now we must aver that this is not the meaning here of Jesus Christ. His kingdom is not of this world, inasmuch as it is not a worldly kingdom, but really a heavenly one. It is not of this world or age, but of the world or age to come. He says, "but now is my kingdom not from hence." That is it is not from this place or from this time, as would be the fact did it exist in this dispensation, in anything more than a preparatory state of formation.

The Jews accused Christ to Pilate of claiming to be a king. "We found this fellow," say they, "forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ, a king." When questioned by Pilate he denied not, but as Paul says "witnessed a good confession" to this very title—"*Thou sayest* that I am a king." To the high priest he says: "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." Daniel says: I saw "one like the son of man," and "he came with the clouds of heaven," and "there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom;" not of this world, but in the end of this world, heavenly and immortal.

Dr. Clarke quotes from Eusebius on this text, that "the relatives of our Lord were brought before Domitian, and interrogated whether they were of the family of David; and what the kingdom of Christ was and when it would appear. "They answered that "his kingdom was heavenly and angelical, and that it would not take place till the end of the world." They did not understand that his kingdom had already come, neither should we. The Scriptures intimate no such idea; but make his coming and kingdom synchronize together; and they are chronologically fixed by the inspired penman to take place in the end of this world, in connection with the resurrection and the judgment.

"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14: 17.)

This text, though usually interpreted otherwise, is in perfect harmony with the idea of a future kingdom. Righteousness, peace, and joy are elements of the kingdom; but do not of themselves alone constitute the kingdom. Just as when it is said "God is love;" love is an element of the divine character, but of itself is not God. No one mistakes here; why should they of the meaning of the text? It is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" that will constitute the bliss of the kingdom, even as their own poets have sung—

"To dwell with God, to taste his love,
Is the full heaven enjoyed above."

"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. 1: 13.)

This text is most evidently a prolepsis. God often "calls things that are not as though they were." Thus God said to Abaaham, "I have made thee a father of many nations," when as yet he had not a son to his name. And so Isaiah spoke of the coming Redeemer: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given," though ages were to intervene before its fulfillment. And in the text those who have a meetness for the heavenly inheritance, are spoken of as having already entered upon it. Hence it is said, that "whom he justified, them he also glorified." But are all the justified saints glorified? They are just as near to that state, as they are to being in the kingdom. Again it is said, "and to wait for his Son from heaven, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." The wrath to come is the wrath of the judgment-day. The deliverance spoken of must be

UMI

proleptical: it cannot be actual and final, until the day of wrath comes. It is in this same strain of anticipating the heavenly kingdom and glory, that the apostle says, we "are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." But the "*receiving*" of the "kingdom" he puts in connection with the shaking of the heavens and the earth, and "the removing of those things that may be shaken;" thus bringing us to the glorified and eternal state.

THE PARABLES ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE KINGDOM.

All the parables of our Savior, illustrative of the kingdom of God, bring into view this same kingdom, and no other. Some show the sacrifices that must be made to gain it; while the greater part teach that only certain characters, the pure and the good, will ever enter it. They are but an enforcement of his solemn words, "Except a man be born again," "except he be converted and become as a little child," he "cannot enter the kingdom of God."

The great mistake is in supposing that the parables *illustrate the gospel* instead of the *kingdom*. If Christ had said "the *gospel* is likened" unto such and such things, then might we well look to see how his parables illustrate the gospel. But he never does this. He says the "*kingdom of God*" *is* "*likened unto*" such and such things. "The kingdom" is the great end and design of the Savior's teachings. And it is our duty to apply the parables in our endeavors to understand them, to the kingdom, as he himself has done.

In the parable of the tares and wheat, as also in that of the net and the fishes, the final destiny if the two classes of mankind is what illustrates the "kingdom of God." We have unmistakably here the winding up of all human probation. The tares are burned," and the "wheat" garnered; the "good fishes are put in vessels," and the "bad cast away." And here is where the kingdom comes in—"THEN shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear."

We have too the same great truth presented in the "kingdom of heaven" being "likened" to a marriage feast; to the wise and foolish virgins; and to the servants to whom were distributed the talents. Those only were admitted to the feast who had on the wedding garment; who had oil in their vessels with their lamps; and those servants only who had improved upon their talents entered into their Master's joy. And here is where they illustrate the kingdom of God. A preparation is needful to enter there; and all who neglect to make it, will find themselves excluded from it at the last. (Luke 13: 24–29.)

Our Savior says:

"The kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened." (Matt. 13: 33.)

The kingdom of God here is usually taken to mean either the grace of God in the heart, or the spread of the gospel in the world. But does it really mean either? Can a person have the grace of God in his heart, and it be hid; not be manifest? Is he not to confess Christ openly; to let his light shine; and be a living epistle, read and known of all men?

And is not the spread of the gospel in the world just as clear to the gaze of men, as the light of the sun; and may we not just as well talk of one being "hid" as the other?

But when we come to the kingdom of God as revealed by Daniel, what is seen of that? Aye, what is seen of that kingdom? God has been preparing its subjects in every age; so silently, so unperceived—like the leaven in the meal—has the work gone on that the monarchs of this world have been startled by no alarms; awakened by no apprehensions of impending danger. And still hidden will it go on, "till the whole is leavened"—the last child of promise redeemed—when the coming king will be heralded by the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God; the thrones and dynasties of the world will be swept away, and Jesus and his "saints take the kingdom, and possess it forever, even forever and ever."

"Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." (Matt. 13: 31, 32.)

To assume that this parable illustrates the spread of the gospel, or increase of the Christian Church in the world, is but begging the whole question. Had the Savior said the *gospel* is like the mustard seed, its application would have been clear. But he declares, the *kingdom of heaven* is like the mustard seed; hence

UMI

proleptical: it cannot be actual and final, until the day of wrath comes. It is in this same strain of anticipating the heavenly kingdom and glory, that the apostle says, we "are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." But the "*receiving*" of the "kingdom" he puts in connection with the shaking of the heavens and the earth, and "the removing of those things that may be shaken;" thus bringing us to the glorified and eternal state.

THE PARABLES ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE KINGDOM.

All the parables of our Savior, illustrative of the kingdom of God, bring into view this same kingdom, and no other. Some show the sacrifices that must be made to gain it; while the greater part teach that only certain characters, the pure and the good, will ever enter it. They are but an enforcement of his solemn words, "Except a man be born again," "except he be converted and become as a little child," he "cannot enter the kingdom of God."

The great mistake is in supposing that the parables *illustrate the gospel* instead of the *kingdom*. If Christ had said "the *gospel* is likened" unto such and such things, then might we well look to see how his parables illustrate the gospel. But he never does this. He says the "*kingdom of God*" *is* "*likened unto*" such and such things. "The kingdom" is the great end and design of the Savior's teachings. And it is our duty to apply the parables in our endeavors to understand them, to the kingdom, as he himself has done.

In the parable of the tares and wheat, as also in that of the net and the fishes, the final destiny if the two classes of mankind is what illustrates the "kingdom of God." We have unmistakably here the winding up of all human probation. The tares are burned," and the "wheat" garnered; the "good fishes are put in vessels," and the "bad cast away." And here is where the kingdom comes in—"THEN shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear."

We have too the same great truth presented in the "kingdom of heaven" being "likened" to a marriage feast; to the wise and foolish virgins; and to the servants to whom were distributed the talents. Those only were admitted to the feast who had on the wedding garment; who had oil in their vessels with their lamps; and those servants only who had improved upon their talents entered into their Master's joy. And here is where they illustrate the kingdom of God. A preparation is needful to enter there; and all who neglect to make it, will find themselves excluded from it at the last. (Luke 13: 24–29.)

Our Savior says:

"The kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened." (Matt. 13: 33.)

The kingdom of God here is usually taken to mean either the grace of God in the heart, or the spread of the gospel in the world. But does it really mean either? Can a person have the grace of God in his heart, and it be hid; not be manifest? Is he not to confess Christ openly; to let his light shine; and be a living epistle, read and known of all men?

And is not the spread of the gospel in the world just as clear to the gaze of men, as the light of the sun; and may we not just as well talk of one being "hid" as the other?

But when we come to the kingdom of God as revealed by Daniel, what is seen of that? Aye, what is seen of that kingdom? God has been preparing its subjects in every age; so silently, so unperceived—like the leaven in the meal—has the work gone on that the monarchs of this world have been startled by no alarms; awakened by no apprehensions of impending danger. And still hidden will it go on, "till the whole is leavened"—the last child of promise redeemed—when the coming king will be heralded by the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God; the thrones and dynasties of the world will be swept away, and Jesus and his "saints take the kingdom, and possess it forever, even forever and ever."

"Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." (Matt. 13: 31, 32.)

To assume that this parable illustrates the spread of the gospel, or increase of the Christian Church in the world, is but begging the whole question. Had the Savior said the *gospel* is like the mustard seed, its application would have been clear. But he declares, the *kingdom of heaven* is like the mustard seed; hence

UMI

it becomes our duty to see how it illustrates—not the gospel—*but the kingdom.* The mustard seed in the parable refers to the subjects of the kingdom. In every age they have been, as compared to the subjects of worldly kingdoms, the least of all: but as the mustard seed to other seeds.

He further contrasts the subjects of the kingdom as seen here, with them as they will appear in the kingdom. It is not the *growth* of the mustard that is taken to illustrate the growing of a kingdom; but the *seed* with its perfected condition. He compares the littleness of the seed with the greatness of the tree. As a seed it is the least, "but when it is *grown*," when it is perfected, it is the greatest of all. So with the kingdom. Its realm will be, "the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven." It subjects, "the saints of the Most High," a "multitude which no man can number," like "the stars of heaven, and the sands upon the seashore innumerable."

The varied expressions "the kingdom of God is come to you;" "is come upon you;" "is come nigh to you;" have in them simply the idea, that it has come beforehand to you. That is, it has come to you in its offers of acceptance; it has come upon you in its evidences of reality and power, by which it will be established, in that I now show you that I have the power to raise the dead, and cast out devils. It has come nigh to you inasmuch as its king elect is now in your very midst, in the very realm he will claim for his empire, and swallowing up death in victory,

> ——"will reign where'er the sun
> Does his successive journeys run."

Repent therefore, for its foreshadowings are now upon you.

This kingdom is the golden age, and only hope of the Church. It is

> "The grand millennial reign begun,"

the eternal Sabbath of rest. It is the "restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all God's holy prophets since the world began." Short of this there is no hope in the Bible, none in the history of this world's progress. Such is man's fallen nature, such the plague-spot of sin ever breaking out afresh; such is natural and moral evil cleaving to all things earthly, that we can hope for nothing permanently good and pure, until the curse shall be removed, the enemy death destroyed, and mortality swallowed up of life. The strong man will keep his house

in all safety, until a stronger than he shall come and bind him, and cast him out and destroy his goods.

All hope of deliverance centers in the coming of the Seed of Abraham, the Son of David; in him whose right it is to reign. Who shall take to himself his great power, wrest the kingdom from the angry nations, and judge and rule the earth in righteousness. Then shall end the long weary night that has hung over our poor sin-stricken world. A sun shall rise upon her that shall no more go down. The voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying, for the days of her mourning shall be ended. The whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge and glory of God, even as the waters cover the sea. No sin, no death, no curse. The kingdom has come, and God's will is done in earth as it is in heaven. All tears are wiped from the eyes of his weeping saints. They are gathered to their beautiful home—gathered "from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God."

"Watchman, what of the night?" Are we not rapidly nearing the time when this glorious day shall be ushered in? When Jesus Christ preached the kingdom of God "*at hand*," did he not instruct us that the watchful servants should "KNOW" when it was "NIGH AT HAND"—nigh, even at the very doors? even as when the fig tree putteth forth its tender leaves we know that summer is near? "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

AN APPROACHING CHANGE.—*The North British Review*, discoursing on the doom of the world, has the following remarks:

"What this change is we dare not even conjecture; but we see in the heavens themselves some traces of destructive elements and some indications of their annihilative power. The fragments of broken planets, the descent of meteoric stones upon our globe, the whirling comets wielding their loose material at the solar surface, the volcanic eruptions in our own satellite, the appearance of new stars, and the disappearance of others, are all foreshadows of that impending convulsion to which the world is doomed. Thus placed on a planet which is to be burnt up, and under heavens which are to pass away; thus residing, as it were, on cemeteries and dwelling upon mausoleums of former worlds, let us learn the lessons of humility and wisdom, if we have not already been taught in the school of revelation."

UMI

it becomes our duty to see how it illustrates—not the gospel—*but the kingdom.* The mustard seed in the parable refers to the subjects of the kingdom. In every age they have been, as compared to the subjects of worldly kingdoms, the least of all: but as the mustard seed to other seeds.

He further contrasts the subjects of the kingdom as seen here, with them as they will appear in the kingdom. It is not the *growth* of the mustard that is taken to illustrate the growing of a kingdom; but the *seed* with its perfected condition. He compares the littleness of the seed with the greatness of the tree. As a seed it is the least, "but when it is *grown*," when it is perfected, it is the greatest of all. So with the kingdom. Its realm will be, "the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven." It subjects, "the saints of the Most High," a "multitude which no man can number," like "the stars of heaven, and the sands upon the seashore innumerable."

The varied expressions "the kingdom of God is come to you;" "is come upon you;" "is come nigh to you;" have in them simply the idea, that it has come beforehand to you. That is, it has come to you in its offers of acceptance; it has come upon you in its evidences of reality and power, by which it will be established, in that I now show you that I have the power to raise the dead, and cast out devils. It has come nigh to you inasmuch as its king elect is now in your very midst, in the very realm he will claim for his empire, and swallowing up death in victory,

> ——"will reign where'er the sun
> Does his successive journeys run."

Repent therefore, for its foreshadowings are now upon you.

This kingdom is the golden age, and only hope of the Church. It is

> "The grand millennial reign begun,"

the eternal Sabbath of rest. It is the "restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all God's holy prophets since the world began." Short of this there is no hope in the Bible, none in the history of this world's progress. Such is man's fallen nature, such the plague-spot of sin ever breaking out afresh; such is natural and moral evil cleaving to all things earthly, that we can hope for nothing permanently good and pure, until the curse shall be removed, the enemy death destroyed, and mortality swallowed up of life. The strong man will keep his house

in all safety, until a stronger than he shall come and bind him, and cast him out and destroy his goods.

All hope of deliverance centers in the coming of the Seed of Abraham, the Son of David; in him whose right it is to reign. Who shall take to himself his great power, wrest the kingdom from the angry nations, and judge and rule the earth in righteousness. Then shall end the long weary night that has hung over our poor sin-stricken world. A sun shall rise upon her that shall no more go down. The voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying, for the days of her mourning shall be ended. The whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge and glory of God, even as the waters cover the sea. No sin, no death, no curse. The kingdom has come, and God's will is done in earth as it is in heaven. All tears are wiped from the eyes of his weeping saints. They are gathered to their beautiful home—gathered "from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God."

"Watchman, what of the night?" Are we not rapidly nearing the time when this glorious day shall be ushered in? When Jesus Christ preached the kingdom of God "*at hand*," did he not instruct us that the watchful servants should "KNOW" when it was "NIGH AT HAND"—nigh, even at the very doors? even as when the fig tree putteth forth its tender leaves we know that summer is near? "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

AN APPROACHING CHANGE.—*The North British Review*, discoursing on the doom of the world, has the following remarks:

"What this change is we dare not even conjecture; but we see in the heavens themselves some traces of destructive elements and some indications of their annihilative power. The fragments of broken planets, the descent of meteoric stones upon our globe, the whirling comets wielding their loose material at the solar surface, the volcanic eruptions in our own satellite, the appearance of new stars, and the disappearance of others, are all foreshadows of that impending convulsion to which the world is doomed. Thus placed on a planet which is to be burnt up, and under heavens which are to pass away; thus residing, as it were, on cemeteries and dwelling upon mausoleums of former worlds, let us learn the lessons of humility and wisdom, if we have not already been taught in the school of revelation."

UMI

LIFE AND DEATH.

"The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6: 23.)

Of all words none have for the human race so transcendent an interest as those little monosyllables life and death. They are the terms which are used in Scripture to express the respective future destinies of the righteous and the wicked. To correctly understand their meaning, therefore, is a matter of very great importance. This ought not to be a difficult task. Nor would it be were it not for the interposition of what are called "theological definitions." There is no difference of opinion among men anywhere concerning the *literal* meaning of the words life and death.

Without attempting a scientific definition of these terms, it will suffice for the present to say, that LIFE means *vital existence*, and that its opposite DEATH means the *extinction of life* or the *cessation of vital existence.*[1] These definitions will be generally accepted as the true meaning of the words life and death when applied to the lower animals, although they are not commonly allowed

[1] The words LIFE and DEATH, with their derivatives, appear to be employed in Scripture to denote the following ideas: LIFE stands for the idea of—

1. *Vital existence*, as distinct from the death or dissolution of vegetable or animal structures; and as opposed to the insensibility of material things. Also, it signifies ETERNAL LIFE.
2. *Activity of movement or agency;* as "living waters;" "the word of God is *quick* [living] and powerful;" "*quicken* thou me in thy way."
3. *Happy existence;* not *happiness* alone, but *happy life.* "In thy favor is life;" "wisdom is a tree of life;" "now I live, if ye stand fast in the Lord."
4. "*To be alive in the Spirit*" is to be living a spiritual life, in opposition to that carnal one of which Paul says, "If ye *live* after the flesh, ye shall die" (Rom. 6: 11), and the "life of God," or godly life. (Eph. 4: 18.)

But LIFE *never* seems to stand for *holiness* alone, or a state of union with God, as is commonly supposed. This appears to be a *purely gratuitous assertion;* on which rests the whole fabric of the opinions which we are venturing to reject. At the same time, it is readily granted that the term *life* is properly *associated* in the case of the righteous with the idea of *holiness*, as it is also with the idea of *happiness: but that it ever loses its proper radical meaning of existence has yet to be proved, and of course the burden of proof lies with the opposite party.*

DEATH, on the other hand, stands for—

1. *The loss or destruction of vegetable or animal life.* "A dead tree;" "a dead lion;" "a dead body."
2. The state of *condemnation to such literal death.* "Thou art but a dead man." (Gen. 20: 7.)
3. *Danger of death.* "Thanks be to God who hath delivered us from so great death." So also "destruction of the flesh," in 1 Cor. 5: 5, is used for a *mortal disease.*
4. To be "*dead to*" anything, signifies *to cease to be or to live in certain relationships to it.* "Dead to the world"—"to sin"—"to the law." But the phrase "dead to God" *never occurs.*
5. To *mortify*, or put to death, signifies to destroy the life of anything, either literally, or in the sense of its *activity and power;* as when it is said "Nabal's heart became *dead* within him."
6. It has never been shown that *death* stands for a state of *misery*, or of *sinfulness, apart from the idea of that literal destruction, or death*, which is the wages of sin.
7. The expression, *spiritual death*, and the distinction between *temporal* and *eternal death*, are alike unknown to the Holy Scriptures. They are, we venture to think, the necessary creations of an erroneous theory.—*Life in Christ*, by the Rev. Edward White.

when spoken of man. But in popular theology man is regarded as an immortal being, and the terms life and death, when applied to him in a future state, are necessarily understood in a figurative sense. Says a distinguished English writer:

"A being who believes he has life already by original creation, in the sense of an unending or immortal existence, is necessitated to understand the promise of life as synonymous with the promise of happiness, and when death is predicated of such a being, it also must be understood in the metaphorical sense of misery, since it is presumed that this native immortality will never be alienated.

"Does not this conversion of the most commonplace terms from their familiar and natural use to a use both unfamiliar and unnatural appear, to say the least, a very singular circumstance? If the language in which the original Scriptures were written could not furnish terms to express the ideas of happiness and misery, then there might be some plausibility for the appropriation of these terms in this arbitrary sense: but the rudest language has its signs for these ideas; and, therefore, there could have been no need, and we should think, too, no reason to set aside the appropriate words, and to employ others in a sense so different from their peculiar signification. Thus employed, the words life and death part with their proper and distinctive signification; and one term especially—the term death—is employed in a sense the very opposite of its original and conventional meaning: *death*, according to the popular theory, is made to signify a *life in misery!*

"Now there are grave objections to this figurative use of the words life and death. In the first place, we have seen they have a very arbitrary and unnatural meaning forced upon them. And in the second place, the conversion of these words from their proper to a very violent and arbitrary meaning has no authority from nor is it demanded by the written word.

"The Bible, professing to be the teacher of mankind in religion, the most interesting and important of subjects, would, of course, not construct a terminology of its own; but make use of the language which the people understood, and employ the terms of such language in their current and conventional meaning; and whenever it was necessary to employ a word different from its customary usage, either the context would make this apparent or there would be some cautionary observation to prevent the possibility of mistake.

"All language is, more or less, figurative; and of all imaginations, the Oriental is the most imaginative; and, therefore, it was to be expected that words would not invariably be used in their strict primary signification: but whenever it should be necessary to employ a word in an unusual sense, there would be ample evidence of its new appropriation. Should there be any danger of misunderstanding the sense in which a word is used, es-

LIFE AND DEATH.

"The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6: 23.)

Of all words none have for the human race so transcendent an interest as those little monosyllables life and death. They are the terms which are used in Scripture to express the respective future destinies of the righteous and the wicked. To correctly understand their meaning, therefore, is a matter of very great importance. This ought not to be a difficult task. Nor would it be were it not for the interposition of what are called "theological definitions." There is no difference of opinion among men anywhere concerning the *literal* meaning of the words life and death.

Without attempting a scientific definition of these terms, it will suffice for the present to say, that LIFE means *vital existence*, and that its opposite DEATH means the *extinction of life* or the *cessation of vital existence.*[1] These definitions will be generally accepted as the true meaning of the words life and death when applied to the lower animals, although they are not commonly allowed

[1] The words LIFE and DEATH, with their derivatives, appear to be employed in Scripture to denote the following ideas: LIFE stands for the idea of—

1. *Vital existence*, as distinct from the death or dissolution of vegetable or animal structures; and as opposed to the insensibility of material things. Also, it signifies ETERNAL LIFE.
2. *Activity of movement or agency;* as "living waters;" "the word of God is *quick* [living] and powerful;" "*quicken* thou me in thy way."
3. *Happy existence;* not *happiness* alone, but *happy life.* "In thy favor is life;" "wisdom is a tree of life;" "now I live, if ye stand fast in the Lord."
4. "*To be alive in the Spirit*" is to be living a spiritual life, in opposition to that carnal one of which Paul says, "If ye *live* after the flesh, ye shall die" (Rom. 6: 11), and the "life of God," or godly life. (Eph. 4: 18.)

But LIFE *never* seems to stand for *holiness* alone, or a state of union with God, as is commonly supposed. This appears to be a *purely gratuitous assertion;* on which rests the whole fabric of the opinions which we are venturing to reject. At the same time, it is readily granted that the term *life* is properly *associated* in the case of the righteous with the idea of *holiness*, as it is also with the idea of *happiness: but that it ever loses its proper radical meaning of existence has yet to be proved, and of course the burden of proof lies with the opposite party.*

DEATH, on the other hand, stands for—

1. *The loss or destruction of vegetable or animal life.* "A dead tree;" "a dead lion;" "a dead body."
2. The state of *condemnation to such literal death.* "Thou art but a dead man." (Gen. 20: 7.)
3. *Danger of death.* "Thanks be to God who hath delivered us from so great death." So also "destruction of the flesh," in 1 Cor. 5: 5, is used for a *mortal disease.*
4. To be "*dead to*" anything, signifies *to cease to be or to live in certain relationships to it.* "Dead to the world"—"to sin"—"to the law." But the phrase "dead to God" *never occurs.*
5. To *mortify*, or put to death, signifies to destroy the life of anything, either literally, or in the sense of its *activity and power;* as when it is said "Nabal's heart became *dead* within him."
6. It has never been shown that *death* stands for a state of *misery*, or of *sinfulness, apart from the idea of that literal destruction, or death*, which is the wages of sin.
7. The expression, *spiritual death*, and the distinction between *temporal* and *eternal death*, are alike unknown to the Holy Scriptures. They are, we venture to think, the necessary creations of an erroneous theory.—*Life in Christ*, by the Rev. Edward White.

when spoken of man. But in popular theology man is regarded as an immortal being, and the terms life and death, when applied to him in a future state, are necessarily understood in a figurative sense. Says a distinguished English writer:

"A being who believes he has life already by original creation, in the sense of an unending or immortal existence, is necessitated to understand the promise of life as synonymous with the promise of happiness, and when death is predicated of such a being, it also must be understood in the metaphorical sense of misery, since it is presumed that this native immortality will never be alienated.

"Does not this conversion of the most commonplace terms from their familiar and natural use to a use both unfamiliar and unnatural appear, to say the least, a very singular circumstance? If the language in which the original Scriptures were written could not furnish terms to express the ideas of happiness and misery, then there might be some plausibility for the appropriation of these terms in this arbitrary sense: but the rudest language has its signs for these ideas; and, therefore, there could have been no need, and we should think, too, no reason to set aside the appropriate words, and to employ others in a sense so different from their peculiar signification. Thus employed, the words life and death part with their proper and distinctive signification; and one term especially—the term death—is employed in a sense the very opposite of its original and conventional meaning: *death*, according to the popular theory, is made to signify a *life in misery!*

"Now there are grave objections to this figurative use of the words life and death. In the first place, we have seen they have a very arbitrary and unnatural meaning forced upon them. And in the second place, the conversion of these words from their proper to a very violent and arbitrary meaning has no authority from nor is it demanded by the written word.

"The Bible, professing to be the teacher of mankind in religion, the most interesting and important of subjects, would, of course, not construct a terminology of its own; but make use of the language which the people understood, and employ the terms of such language in their current and conventional meaning; and whenever it was necessary to employ a word different from its customary usage, either the context would make this apparent or there would be some cautionary observation to prevent the possibility of mistake.

"All language is, more or less, figurative; and of all imaginations, the Oriental is the most imaginative; and, therefore, it was to be expected that words would not invariably be used in their strict primary signification: but whenever it should be necessary to employ a word in an unusual sense, there would be ample evidence of its new appropriation. Should there be any danger of misunderstanding the sense in which a word is used, es-

pecially if upon that word depended important doctrine, then we might expect such a cautionary notice of its new meaning, as is furnished, for example, in the book of Revelation (ch. 11: 8), where the great city is called Sodom and Egypt, and we are carefully informed that it is so called 'spiritually.' [See another example in John 7: 38, 39; also, Gal. 3: 23–25.]

"But the words in question have no such admonitory notice, which is the more surprising since such a usage of them, as the Scriptures are alleged to furnish, is contrary to all custom; and being employed to teach very vital doctrines, such an admonition is the more necessary, and to be expected. The fact that the Bible has no inspired glossary or explanation of terms, renders it the more imperative that all its words should be employed according to established usage; and is in itself a tacit proof that such *is* the sense in which every word is used. I conclude, therefore, that the words life and death, as used in the Bible, are to be understood in the same sense they obtain in ordinary language—that is, except when obvious reasons demand a figurative meaning for them—in their plain, literal, conventional signification—not respectively happiness and misery, but existence and non-existence."[1]

It is plain to all that *life* does not necessarily include the idea of *happiness;* since one may possess life and not happiness. The converse of this, however, is not true. If we possess happiness we must necessarily possess life. Life is the necessary foundation of all positive good. To borrow the language of Abp. Whately:

"It is certain that the words life, eternal life, immortality, &c., are always applied to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall at the last day be approved as 'good and faithful servants, who are to enter into the joy of their Lord.' 'Life,' as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean 'happy' life. And that theirs will be a happy life we are indeed plainly taught; but I do not think we are anywhere taught that the word 'life' does of itself necessarily imply happiness. If so indeed, it would be a mere tautology to speak of a 'happy life;' and a contradiction to speak of a 'miserable life,' which we know is not the case, according to the usage of any language. In all ages and countries, 'life,' and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied in ordinary discourse to a wretched life no less properly than to a happy one. Life, therefore, in the received sense of the word, would apply equally to the condition of the blest, and of the condemned, supposing these last to be destined to continue forever living in a state of misery. And yet, to *their* condition the words 'life' and 'immortality' never are applied in Scripture. If therefore we suppose

[1] *Life and Death*, by J. Panton Ham, ch. 2.

the hearers of Jesus and his apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible, in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean (if they were taught nothing to the contrary) that the condemned were really and literally to be 'destroyed,' and cease to exist; not that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness. For they are never spoken of as being kept alive, but as *forfeiting* life: as for instance: 'Ye will not come unto me that ye may *have life*.' 'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath *not* life.' And again, 'perdition,' 'death,' 'destruction,' are employed in numerous passages to express the doom of the condemned. All which expressions would, as I have said, be naturally taken in their usual and obvious sense, if nothing were taught to the contrary."[1]

Hiram Mattison, in a recently published work, says:

"Future *happiness alone* is conditioned upon faith in Christ, and *not our future being*. Consequently, the future non-existence of the wicked cannot follow for lack of a vital connection with Christ, by faith in him. He is 'our life' in that he restores the soul to spiritual life by his Spirit, raises our bodies from the dead, and finally crowns the righteous with glory in heaven. But *our immortal existence is not made dependent upon the reception or rejection of salvation through his name.* We shall exist forever, whether in happiness through faith in Christ and a holy life, or in misery through a life of sin and the rejection of offered mercy through him, the only Savior."[2]

In accordance with this statement of Orthodoxy, is the assertion of a writer in *The Eclectic Review* for August, 1845:

"The term life, when used descriptively of the future state of the righteous, does not denote existence, but happiness exclusively."[3]

Let us proceed at once to try these confident assertions of Orthodoxy, by an appeal to the supreme authority of the Scriptures. Fortunately we have an inspired definition of the term "life," which furnishes the highest and most satisfactory proof, that the Holy Spirit dictated the word in its literal sense:

"He asked *life* of thee, and thou gavest it him, *even* LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER." (Ps. 21: 4.)

Here we have one of the most explicit phrases for "immortal existence," used to define 'life' [eternal life], and applied to one

[1] *Scripture Revelations of a Future State*, p. 228.
[2] *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 68.
[3] See Dobney, *Future Punishment*, p. 192.

UMI

pecially if upon that word depended important doctrine, then we might expect such a cautionary notice of its new meaning, as is furnished, for example, in the book of Revelation (ch. 11: 8), where the great city is called Sodom and Egypt, and we are carefully informed that it is so called 'spiritually.' [See another example in John 7: 38, 39; also, Gal. 3: 23–25.]

"But the words in question have no such admonitory notice, which is the more surprising since such a usage of them, as the Scriptures are alleged to furnish, is contrary to all custom; and being employed to teach very vital doctrines, such an admonition is the more necessary, and to be expected. The fact that the Bible has no inspired glossary or explanation of terms, renders it the more imperative that all its words should be employed according to established usage; and is in itself a tacit proof that such *is* the sense in which every word is used. I conclude, therefore, that the words life and death, as used in the Bible, are to be understood in the same sense they obtain in ordinary language—that is, except when obvious reasons demand a figurative meaning for them—in their plain, literal, conventional signification—not respectively happiness and misery, but existence and non-existence."[1]

It is plain to all that *life* does not necessarily include the idea of *happiness;* since one may possess life and not happiness. The converse of this, however, is not true. If we possess happiness we must necessarily possess life. Life is the necessary foundation of all positive good. To borrow the language of Abp. Whately:

"It is certain that the words life, eternal life, immortality, &c., are always applied to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall at the last day be approved as 'good and faithful servants, who are to enter into the joy of their Lord.' 'Life,' as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean 'happy' life. And that theirs will be a happy life we are indeed plainly taught; but I do not think we are anywhere taught that the word 'life' does of itself necessarily imply happiness. If so indeed, it would be a mere tautology to speak of a 'happy life;' and a contradiction to speak of a 'miserable life,' which we know is not the case, according to the usage of any language. In all ages and countries, 'life,' and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied in ordinary discourse to a wretched life no less properly than to a happy one. Life, therefore, in the received sense of the word, would apply equally to the condition of the blest, and of the condemned, supposing these last to be destined to continue forever living in a state of misery. And yet, to *their* condition the words 'life' and 'immortality' never are applied in Scripture. If therefore we suppose

[1] *Life and Death*, by J. Panton Ham, ch. 2.

the hearers of Jesus and his apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible, in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean (if they were taught nothing to the contrary) that the condemned were really and literally to be 'destroyed,' and cease to exist; not that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness. For they are never spoken of as being kept alive, but as *forfeiting* life: as for instance: 'Ye will not come unto me that ye may *have life*.' 'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath *not* life.' And again, 'perdition,' 'death,' 'destruction,' are employed in numerous passages to express the doom of the condemned. All which expressions would, as I have said, be naturally taken in their usual and obvious sense, if nothing were taught to the contrary."[1]

Hiram Mattison, in a recently published work, says:

"Future *happiness alone* is conditioned upon faith in Christ, and *not our future being*. Consequently, the future non-existence of the wicked cannot follow for lack of a vital connection with Christ, by faith in him. He is 'our life' in that he restores the soul to spiritual life by his Spirit, raises our bodies from the dead, and finally crowns the righteous with glory in heaven. But *our immortal existence is not made dependent upon the reception or rejection of salvation through his name.* We shall exist forever, whether in happiness through faith in Christ and a holy life, or in misery through a life of sin and the rejection of offered mercy through him, the only Savior."[2]

In accordance with this statement of Orthodoxy, is the assertion of a writer in *The Eclectic Review* for August, 1845:

"The term life, when used descriptively of the future state of the righteous, does not denote existence, but happiness exclusively."[3]

Let us proceed at once to try these confident assertions of Orthodoxy, by an appeal to the supreme authority of the Scriptures. Fortunately we have an inspired definition of the term "life," which furnishes the highest and most satisfactory proof, that the Holy Spirit dictated the word in its literal sense:

"He asked *life* of thee, and thou gavest it him, *even* LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER." (Ps. 21: 4.)

Here we have one of the most explicit phrases for "immortal existence," used to define 'life' [eternal life], and applied to one

[1] *Scripture Revelations of a Future State*, p. 228.
[2] *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 68.
[3] See Dobney, *Future Punishment*, p. 192.

UMI

who asked it of God. Again we read: "His seed shall endure forever." (Ps. 89: 36.) "With long life will I satisfy him." (Ps. 91: 16.) It may be said that these passages refer to Christ, and that they cannot, therefore, be used as evidence to show the meaning of the word "life" when applied to the future condition of righteous *men*. This anticipated objection, however, would not prove that these passages are impertinent to the question discussed; for Jesus said to his disciples, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14: 19.) And the author of the epistle to the Hebrews says: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (ch. 7: 25.) And again Jesus says, "I give unto my sheep *eternal life*, and they shall never perish." (John 10: 28.) Will the reader be so kind as to carefully notice the absolute conclusiveness of the above passages? The eternal life promised to the faithful follower of Christ is 'LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER.' How brightly the truth shines when contrasted with error!

Notice the significant contrasts in the following passages:

"The thief cometh not, but for to steal and *to kill* and *to destroy;* I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it more abundantly." (John 10: 10.)

"Whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have *everlasting life*." (John 3: 16.)

In these passages, if a metaphorical meaning be placed upon the word 'life,' then the contrasted terms 'destroy' and 'perish' must also be metaphorically explained. But where, it may be asked, is the similitude or resemblance between *destruction* and a *life* of endless misery? Life *may* include happiness; but destruction *cannot* include the idea of endless misery.

If on the other hand we examine the literal meaning of the words 'destroy' and 'perish,' we shall find that they are directly opposed to the idea of the continuance in being of the object to which they are applied. (The only exceptions to this rule are found in "theological definitions.") To destroy means to demolish; to ruin; to bring to naught; to annihilate; to kill; to extirpate; to put an end to. Perish; (literally to depart wholly;) to die; to lose life in any manner; to be destroyed; to come to nothing. The apostle Peter, speaking of the final doom of wicked men, says "they shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." (2 Pet. 2: 12.) The language here used is so forcible that even President Dwight says: "It cannot be denied that the destruction spoken of in this passage is declared to be absolute, and must be either annihilation or eternal wo."[1]

The apostle Paul, in speaking of the wicked at the second coming of Christ, says: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1: 9.) Orthodoxy interprets this passage to mean that the wicked shall be punished with everlasting misery! And when the same apostle says "the wages of sin is *death*," this "tremendous Orthodoxy" says, Not so; for the wages of sin is not literal destruction, but eternal life in torment! This shocking perversion of Scripture is directly traceable to the metaphorical sense invariably given by popular theology to the words 'life' and 'death' when applied to the future state of the righteous and wicked of the human race.

Mr. Mattison has a chapter entitled, "Immortal existence not a result of faith in Christ."[2] This sentiment is endorsed by the leading Protestant Church of America; and not only this Church, but all Orthodox Churches must admit the conclusion, as they accept the premises upon which it is legitimately based. The reader's special attention is invited to the issue thus fairly joined between Orthodoxy and the Bible. What then is the testimony? What saith the faithful Witness?

"If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God, which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son* HATH LIFE; and *he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*" (John 5: 9-12.)

The phrase "immortal existence" when applied to man means the same as 'eternal life.' The full sense of the passage would be preserved if it were read thus: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us an immortal existence, and this existence is in his Son! He that hath the Son hath an immortal existence; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not an immortal existence."

It is written, "The just shall live by his faith." (Hab. 2: 4.) This text is quoted by the apostle Paul in Rom. 1: 17, and Gal.

[1] *Theology*, vol. 4, p. 460.
[2] *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, ch. 6.

UMI

who asked it of God. Again we read: "His seed shall endure forever." (Ps. 89: 36.) "With long life will I satisfy him." (Ps. 91: 16.) It may be said that these passages refer to Christ, and that they cannot, therefore, be used as evidence to show the meaning of the word "life" when applied to the future condition of righteous *men*. This anticipated objection, however, would not prove that these passages are impertinent to the question discussed; for Jesus said to his disciples, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14: 19.) And the author of the epistle to the Hebrews says: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (ch. 7: 25.) And again Jesus says, "I give unto my sheep *eternal life*, and they shall never perish." (John 10: 28.) Will the reader be so kind as to carefully notice the absolute conclusiveness of the above passages? The eternal life promised to the faithful follower of Christ is 'LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER.' How brightly the truth shines when contrasted with error!

Notice the significant contrasts in the following passages:

"The thief cometh not, but for to steal and *to kill* and *to destroy;* I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it more abundantly." (John 10: 10.)

"Whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have *everlasting life*." (John 3: 16.)

In these passages, if a metaphorical meaning be placed upon the word 'life,' then the contrasted terms 'destroy' and 'perish' must also be metaphorically explained. But where, it may be asked, is the similitude or resemblance between *destruction* and a *life* of endless misery? Life *may* include happiness; but destruction *cannot* include the idea of endless misery.

If on the other hand we examine the literal meaning of the words 'destroy' and 'perish,' we shall find that they are directly opposed to the idea of the continuance in being of the object to which they are applied. (The only exceptions to this rule are found in "theological definitions.") To destroy means to demolish; to ruin; to bring to naught; to annihilate; to kill; to extirpate; to put an end to. Perish; (literally to depart wholly;) to die; to lose life in any manner; to be destroyed; to come to nothing. The apostle Peter, speaking of the final doom of wicked men, says "they shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." (2 Pet. 2: 12.) The language here used is so forcible that even President Dwight says: "It cannot be denied that the destruction spoken of in this passage is declared to be absolute, and must be either annihilation or eternal wo."[1]

The apostle Paul, in speaking of the wicked at the second coming of Christ, says: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1: 9.) Orthodoxy interprets this passage to mean that the wicked shall be punished with everlasting misery! And when the same apostle says "the wages of sin is *death*," this "tremendous Orthodoxy" says, Not so; for the wages of sin is not literal destruction, but eternal life in torment! This shocking perversion of Scripture is directly traceable to the metaphorical sense invariably given by popular theology to the words 'life' and 'death' when applied to the future state of the righteous and wicked of the human race.

Mr. Mattison has a chapter entitled, "Immortal existence not a result of faith in Christ."[2] This sentiment is endorsed by the leading Protestant Church of America; and not only this Church, but all Orthodox Churches must admit the conclusion, as they accept the premises upon which it is legitimately based. The reader's special attention is invited to the issue thus fairly joined between Orthodoxy and the Bible. What then is the testimony? What saith the faithful Witness?

"If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God, which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son* HATH LIFE; and *he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*" (John 5: 9-12.)

The phrase "immortal existence" when applied to man means the same as 'eternal life.' The full sense of the passage would be preserved if it were read thus: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us an immortal existence, and this existence is in his Son! He that hath the Son hath an immortal existence; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not an immortal existence."

It is written, "The just shall live by his faith." (Hab. 2: 4.) This text is quoted by the apostle Paul in Rom. 1: 17, and Gal.

[1] *Theology*, vol. 4, p. 460.
[2] *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, ch. 6.

UMI

3: 11. It is also said, "Without faith it is impossible to please him." (Heb. 11: 6.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3: 25.) "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have *life* through his name." (John 20: 31.) "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6: 23.) "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." (John 3: 36.) These passages conclusively prove that 'eternal life' or immortal existence is a result of faith in Christ.

The same conclusion is reached from considering the distinctive titles given to Christ by the writers of the New Testament. He is called "the Prince of life" (or Author of life, margin) in Acts 3: 15; "Christ, our Life" in Col. 3: 4; and in the Syriac Version, he is frequently called the "Vivifier" and the "Life-giver."[1] There are many passages of Scripture which support his right to those titles. Jesus himself said: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life." (John 10: 27, 28.) "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." (John 17: 2.) "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst: but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life." (John 4: 14; see also Ps. 36: 9.) "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." (Rev. 2: 7.) Every one of these passages is directly opposed to the notion of man's natural immortality. For it is evident that eternal life is not promised to all men, but to the faithful alone. If all men have an immortal existence guaranteed to them by the deathlessness of their nature, in what sense is Christ called the Life-giver?

The tree of life in Eden was to Adam a pledge of immortality

[1] In the Syraic version of the New Testament the subject of *life* is made more prominent than in the "authorized English version." This will be noticed in the following passages from Prof. Murdock's translation:
Acts 4: 12: "There is not another name under heaven, which is given to men, *whereby to live*."
Acts 5: 31: "Him hath God established as a Head and *Life-giver*."
Rom. 1: 16: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God *unto life*, to all who believe."
John 12: 47: "I did not come to judge the world, but to *vivify* the world."
Acts 16: 31: "Believe on the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah, *thou will have* LIFE."
Phil. 3: 20: "Our concern is from heaven; and from thence we expect our VIVIFIER, our Lord Jesus Messiah."
Heb. 7: 25: "And he is able to *vivify* forever them who come to God by him."
2 Tim. 1: 10: "The appearing of our *Life-giver*, Jesus the Messiah, who hath abolished death, and hath made manifest life and immortality by the Gospel."
2 Tim. 3: 15: "From thy childhood thou was taught the holy books, which can make thee wise unto *life*, by faith in Jesus the Messiah."
2 Tim. 4: 18: "My Lord will rescue me from every evil work; and will give me *life* in his heavenly kingdom."

so long as he preserved his innocence. It was not the emblem of "happiness exclusively," but of life in its literal sense of continued existence. So, too, the tree of life in the Paradise of God is the symbol of eternal life or immortal existence. But this magnificent inheritance is only promised "to him that overcometh." The result to Adam of being driven out from the tree of life in Eden was not merely unhappiness, but literal death. In carrying out the analogy, therefore, we cannot suppose that those who are to be excluded from the tree of life in Paradise will be immortal.

That Christ is the bestower of life in the literal sense of that term, is further evident from his language in John 5: 21: "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." To this agrees the language of the apostle Paul: "The last Adam was made a quickening [that is, a life-giving] Spirit." (1 Cor. 15: 45.) We cannot in this place substitute the metaphorical sense of the word life, by saying that Christ bestows life on whom he will, in the sense of bestowing happiness only; for the subject of both paragraphs is the resurrection or re-enlivening of dead men, and not the conferring of happiness upon those who were already in possession of eternal life.

Let me now pause to ask, In which of the recorded discourses of our Lord or of his apostles shall we find the unconditional immortality of all men affirmed?

And if for the very best of reasons this question cannot be answered, let me ask, Where have we any Scriptural authority for saying that Christ is the bestower of *happiness*, but not of *life?*

No interpretation will take us through the New Testament without manifest absurdities or obvious contradictions, except that which attaches to the phrase eternal life the meaning of *immortal existence*. In support of this assertion, and as further evidence in favor of the literal sense of the word life, some additional passages from the Gospel of John may be adduced, which appear to be fatal to the popular theory. The most prominent feature in the recorded discourses of our Lord is the promise of EVERLASTING LIFE. The assertion of the apostle in the opening of the chapter is most sigificant. "IN HIM WAS LIFE; and THE LIFE was the light of men." (ch. 1: 4.) This passage evidently denotes that he who is expressly designated as 'THE LIFE' had

3: 11. It is also said, "Without faith it is impossible to please him." (Heb. 11: 6.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3: 25.) "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have *life* through his name." (John 20: 31.) "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6: 23.) "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." (John 3: 36.) These passages conclusively prove that 'eternal life' or immortal existence is a result of faith in Christ.

The same conclusion is reached from considering the distinctive titles given to Christ by the writers of the New Testament. He is called "the Prince of life" (or Author of life, margin) in Acts 3: 15; "Christ, our Life" in Col. 3: 4; and in the Syriac Version, he is frequently called the "Vivifier" and the "Life-giver."[1] There are many passages of Scripture which support his right to those titles. Jesus himself said: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life." (John 10: 27, 28.) "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." (John 17: 2.) "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst: but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life." (John 4: 14; see also Ps. 36: 9.) "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." (Rev. 2: 7.) Every one of these passages is directly opposed to the notion of man's natural immortality. For it is evident that eternal life is not promised to all men, but to the faithful alone. If all men have an immortal existence guaranteed to them by the deathlessness of their nature, in what sense is Christ called the Life-giver?

The tree of life in Eden was to Adam a pledge of immortality

[1] In the Syraic version of the New Testament the subject of *life* is made more prominent than in the "authorized English version." This will be noticed in the following passages from Prof. Murdock's translation:
Acts 4: 12: "There is not another name under heaven, which is given to men, *whereby to live*."
Acts 5: 31: "Him hath God established as a Head and *Life-giver*."
Rom. 1: 16: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God *unto life*, to all who believe."
John 12: 47: "I did not come to judge the world, but to *vivify* the world."
Acts 16: 31: "Believe on the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah, *thou will have* LIFE."
Phil. 3: 20: "Our concern is from heaven; and from thence we expect our VIVIFIER, our Lord Jesus Messiah."
Heb. 7: 25: "And he is able to *vivify* forever them who come to God by him."
2 Tim. 1: 10: "The appearing of our *Life-giver*, Jesus the Messiah, who hath abolished death, and hath made manifest life and immortality by the Gospel."
2 Tim. 3: 15: "From thy childhood thou was taught the holy books, which can make thee wise unto *life*, by faith in Jesus the Messiah."
2 Tim. 4: 18: "My Lord will rescue me from every evil work; and will give me *life* in his heavenly kingdom."

so long as he preserved his innocence. It was not the emblem of "happiness exclusively," but of life in its literal sense of continued existence. So, too, the tree of life in the Paradise of God is the symbol of eternal life or immortal existence. But this magnificent inheritance is only promised "to him that overcometh." The result to Adam of being driven out from the tree of life in Eden was not merely unhappiness, but literal death. In carrying out the analogy, therefore, we cannot suppose that those who are to be excluded from the tree of life in Paradise will be immortal.

That Christ is the bestower of life in the literal sense of that term, is further evident from his language in John 5: 21: "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." To this agrees the language of the apostle Paul: "The last Adam was made a quickening [that is, a life-giving] Spirit." (1 Cor. 15: 45.) We cannot in this place substitute the metaphorical sense of the word life, by saying that Christ bestows life on whom he will, in the sense of bestowing happiness only; for the subject of both paragraphs is the resurrection or re-enlivening of dead men, and not the conferring of happiness upon those who were already in possession of eternal life.

Let me now pause to ask, In which of the recorded discourses of our Lord or of his apostles shall we find the unconditional immortality of all men affirmed?

And if for the very best of reasons this question cannot be answered, let me ask, Where have we any Scriptural authority for saying that Christ is the bestower of *happiness*, but not of *life?*

No interpretation will take us through the New Testament without manifest absurdities or obvious contradictions, except that which attaches to the phrase eternal life the meaning of *immortal existence*. In support of this assertion, and as further evidence in favor of the literal sense of the word life, some additional passages from the Gospel of John may be adduced, which appear to be fatal to the popular theory. The most prominent feature in the recorded discourses of our Lord is the promise of EVERLASTING LIFE. The assertion of the apostle in the opening of the chapter is most sigificant. "IN HIM WAS LIFE; and THE LIFE was the light of men." (ch. 1: 4.) This passage evidently denotes that he who is expressly designated as 'THE LIFE' had

the power to impart life to others. The same meaning is seen in the parallel passage (John 5 : 26): "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here life cannot be taken to mean happiness merely, without destroying the congruous signification of the whole passage. The context would not justify the use of the word 'life' as a metaphor. For in the preceding verses our Lord ascribed to himself the power to raise up and give life to the dead; and in ch. 6 : 53, 54 he says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." How plainly do these passages teach that immortality is conditional; and that the expression 'eternal life' is to be taken in its strictly literal sense of immortal existence!

This conclusion is supported by the language of our Lord in ch. 6 : 57, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." And in ch. 5 : 28, 29 he says: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of *life;* and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Here it is impossible to spiritualize the word 'life' without destroying the sense of the whole passage. The wicked as well as the righteous are to be raised from the graves, but only those who have "done good" shall obtain the "resurrection of life." The frequent reference in the fifth and sixth chapters to the physical ideas of resurrection from "the graves," and to the privilege of living instead of dying, as the fathers in the wilderness died, shows very decisively that the future 'life' promised is intended in a literal and not in a metaphorical sense.

Our Lord said to the Jews: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (John 6 : 49–51.) "I will raise him up at the last day." (ch. 6 : 40, 44, 54.) Why is reference made to the resurrection of the dead, if the life spoken of as the result of it means only the happiness of beings already immortal? Were there not words

enough in the Greek language to properly express such a meaning had it been intended? If so, how are we justified in uniformly giving a figurative turn to words which everywhere else are taken in their literal sense?

Will it be said that the life spoken of includes the resurrection of the body, *and* the happiness of the soul already immortal? What then mean these words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you?*" (John 6 : 53.) Will our Orthodox opponents say that the WICKED will not be raised to have an eternal existence in the body? An affirmative answer would end the controversy.

When our Lord represents himself as the "bread of life," he plainly intimates thereby that the one great object of his mission was to *give life.* A self-reliant and spiritualistic Orthodoxy confidently asserts that the Lord Jesus is not the source of future life to believers; that all men are to have an immortal existence, let their conduct be what it may; that it is not as the bestower of immortality, but of everlasting happiness, that he styles himself the "Bread of Life." Such a doctrine finds not the slightest support in Scripture, unless it be in Gen. 3 : 4, where the Serpent said to our common mother, "Ye shall not surely die."

The immediate object of the use of bread is to sustain life, not to confer happiness. There are thousands at this very hour who have an abundance of bread, and yet lead a most wretched life. It is not then as the bestower of "happiness exclusively" that Christ is called the Bread of Life, but because the Father has constituted him as the Giver of immortality to all who obey him.

Another very plain instance of the use of the word "life" in its literal sense occurs in the statement of our Lord to Martha, in John 11 : 25, 26: "I am the resurrection and the *life;* he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Now the word 'resurrection' in this passage must of necessity be taken in its literal sense. It would therefore be a violation of all just principles of interpretation to say that the word 'life' in this sentence must be taken figuratively. For it is obvious that in the same sense that Christ is 'the resurrection' he is 'the life.' "I am the resurrection *and the life.*" To take one of these words literally, and to convert the other into a metaphor, would be a perversion of Scripture to serve a theory. Besides, the context exhibits the sense in which the words were used. Our

UMI

the power to impart life to others. The same meaning is seen in the parallel passage (John 5 : 26): "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here life cannot be taken to mean happiness merely, without destroying the congruous signification of the whole passage. The context would not justify the use of the word 'life' as a metaphor. For in the preceding verses our Lord ascribed to himself the power to raise up and give life to the dead; and in ch. 6 : 53, 54 he says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." How plainly do these passages teach that immortality is conditional; and that the expression 'eternal life' is to be taken in its strictly literal sense of immortal existence!

This conclusion is supported by the language of our Lord in ch. 6 : 57, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." And in ch. 5 : 28, 29 he says: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of *life;* and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Here it is impossible to spiritualize the word 'life' without destroying the sense of the whole passage. The wicked as well as the righteous are to be raised from the graves, but only those who have "done good" shall obtain the "resurrection of life." The frequent reference in the fifth and sixth chapters to the physical ideas of resurrection from "the graves," and to the privilege of living instead of dying, as the fathers in the wilderness died, shows very decisively that the future 'life' promised is intended in a literal and not in a metaphorical sense.

Our Lord said to the Jews: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (John 6 : 49–51.) "I will raise him up at the last day." (ch. 6 : 40, 44, 54.) Why is reference made to the resurrection of the dead, if the life spoken of as the result of it means only the happiness of beings already immortal? Were there not words

enough in the Greek language to properly express such a meaning had it been intended? If so, how are we justified in uniformly giving a figurative turn to words which everywhere else are taken in their literal sense?

Will it be said that the life spoken of includes the resurrection of the body, *and* the happiness of the soul already immortal? What then mean these words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you?*" (John 6 : 53.) Will our Orthodox opponents say that the WICKED will not be raised to have an eternal existence in the body? An affirmative answer would end the controversy.

When our Lord represents himself as the "bread of life," he plainly intimates thereby that the one great object of his mission was to *give life.* A self-reliant and spiritualistic Orthodoxy confidently asserts that the Lord Jesus is not the source of future life to believers; that all men are to have an immortal existence, let their conduct be what it may; that it is not as the bestower of immortality, but of everlasting happiness, that he styles himself the "Bread of Life." Such a doctrine finds not the slightest support in Scripture, unless it be in Gen. 3 : 4, where the Serpent said to our common mother, "Ye shall not surely die."

The immediate object of the use of bread is to sustain life, not to confer happiness. There are thousands at this very hour who have an abundance of bread, and yet lead a most wretched life. It is not then as the bestower of "happiness exclusively" that Christ is called the Bread of Life, but because the Father has constituted him as the Giver of immortality to all who obey him.

Another very plain instance of the use of the word "life" in its literal sense occurs in the statement of our Lord to Martha, in John 11 : 25, 26: "I am the resurrection and the *life;* he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Now the word 'resurrection' in this passage must of necessity be taken in its literal sense. It would therefore be a violation of all just principles of interpretation to say that the word 'life' in this sentence must be taken figuratively. For it is obvious that in the same sense that Christ is 'the resurrection' he is 'the life.' "I am the resurrection *and the life.*" To take one of these words literally, and to convert the other into a metaphor, would be a perversion of Scripture to serve a theory. Besides, the context exhibits the sense in which the words were used. Our

UMI

Lord teaches that he would raise to life those who had believed in him, but were already dead; while of living believers he asserts they "shall never die;" that is, according to the literal rendering of the Greek, "they shall not die forever." They shall not die in the absolute sense in which the term 'second death' is used, but their death will be a falling asleep in Jesus.[1]

It will not do to spiritualize the words 'life,' and 'he shall live,' 'dead,' and 'shall not die forever;' for there is no question raised either in the text or context about spiritual death and life, nor about happiness and misery.

Once more: in ch. 12: 25, our Lord, in addressing the Greeks who came up to worship at the feast, uses this remarkable language: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

No ingenuity of reasoning can make this passage teach the popular doctrine. It is utterly opposed to the idea that men have eternal life in themselves. For it is plain that a man cannot lose his life and have it at the same time; yet our Lord declares "he that loveth his life *shall* lose it." What is it which a man is here represented as loving? And what is it that he will keep unto life eternal if he hate it in this world? The obvious answer to these questions must carry with it the conviction to every unbiased mind, that Christ is truly the *Life-giver*, in the sense that he gives the pricelesss boon of IMMORTALITY to all who love and obey him.

The great theme upon which Christ and his apostles delighted to dwell was life, *eternal life*. Well did Peter say unto his Lord, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." (John 6: 68.) An inspired apostle has declared that "Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 10.) This revelation was brought about by the personal resurrection of Christ, who afterwards appearing to John in Patmos, says (Rev. 1: 18): "I am he that *liveth* and was dead; and behold I am *alive* for evermore." When we read this sublime utterance, our hearts are cheered with the hope of life, for we remember that precious promise of the Life-giver, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14: 19.) He might just as easily have said, "Because I am happy, ye shall be happy also;" but this would not have been the full or radical idea intended. He and his apostles uniformly use the more comprehensive term "life," without which no other good is possible.

[1] Another exposition makes this promise refer to the living saints at the second coming of Christ. See 1 Thess. 4: 15; 1 Cor. 15: 21.

But it may be asked, Will not the future life of the redeemed be a happy one? Most assuredly it will; but we do not get this idea from the word life itself, but from those passages of Scripture in which the felicity of those who receive the gift of life, is specifically mentioned.

The question at issue is not whether Christ bestows mere existence only, but whether he bestows existence at all. The Orthodox position is, that he is the bestower of happiness *only;* that men are not dependent upon him for future *life*, as they are naturally immortal, and consequently deathless.

The utter absence of any necessity for substituting the word 'happiness' for 'life,' when the latter term is applied to describe the future state of the righteous, is seen from the following language of Scripture:

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. 2: 9.) "In thy presence is FULLNESS OF JOY; at thy right hand are PLEASURES FOR EVERMORE." (Ps. 16: 11.)

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.*" (John 14: 2, 3.) "We shall ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 17.) "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, YE BLESSED *of my Father*, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25: 34.)

"*Blessed* and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." (Rev. 20: 6.)

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, *and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be* NO MORE DEATH, *neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain*, for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21: 3, 4.)

What a magnificent destiny awaits the faithful follower of Christ! To be forever with the Lord; to share in the pure pleasures of the angels; to be forever free from all pain and sorrow; to be assured that perfect peace will never be disturbed by the corroding cares of mortal life—all this will be inexpressibly glorious!

If a righteous man has even in this world, while fully trusting

Lord teaches that he would raise to life those who had believed in him, but were already dead; while of living believers he asserts they "shall never die;" that is, according to the literal rendering of the Greek, "they shall not die forever." They shall not die in the absolute sense in which the term 'second death' is used, but their death will be a falling asleep in Jesus.[1]

It will not do to spiritualize the words 'life,' and 'he shall live,' 'dead,' and 'shall not die forever;' for there is no question raised either in the text or context about spiritual death and life, nor about happiness and misery.

Once more: in ch. 12: 25, our Lord, in addressing the Greeks who came up to worship at the feast, uses this remarkable language: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

No ingenuity of reasoning can make this passage teach the popular doctrine. It is utterly opposed to the idea that men have eternal life in themselves. For it is plain that a man cannot lose his life and have it at the same time; yet our Lord declares "he that loveth his life *shall* lose it." What is it which a man is here represented as loving? And what is it that he will keep unto life eternal if he hate it in this world? The obvious answer to these questions must carry with it the conviction to every unbiased mind, that Christ is truly the *Life-giver*, in the sense that he gives the pricelesss boon of IMMORTALITY to all who love and obey him.

The great theme upon which Christ and his apostles delighted to dwell was life, *eternal life*. Well did Peter say unto his Lord, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." (John 6: 68.) An inspired apostle has declared that "Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 10.) This revelation was brought about by the personal resurrection of Christ, who afterwards appearing to John in Patmos, says (Rev. 1: 18): "I am he that *liveth* and was dead; and behold I am *alive* for evermore." When we read this sublime utterance, our hearts are cheered with the hope of life, for we remember that precious promise of the Life-giver, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14: 19.) He might just as easily have said, "Because I am happy, ye shall be happy also;" but this would not have been the full or radical idea intended. He and his apostles uniformly use the more comprehensive term "life," without which no other good is possible.

[1] Another exposition makes this promise refer to the living saints at the second coming of Christ. See 1 Thess. 4: 15; 1 Cor. 15: 21.

But it may be asked, Will not the future life of the redeemed be a happy one? Most assuredly it will; but we do not get this idea from the word life itself, but from those passages of Scripture in which the felicity of those who receive the gift of life, is specifically mentioned.

The question at issue is not whether Christ bestows mere existence only, but whether he bestows existence at all. The Orthodox position is, that he is the bestower of happiness *only;* that men are not dependent upon him for future *life*, as they are naturally immortal, and consequently deathless.

The utter absence of any necessity for substituting the word 'happiness' for 'life,' when the latter term is applied to describe the future state of the righteous, is seen from the following language of Scripture:

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. 2: 9.) "In thy presence is FULLNESS OF JOY; at thy right hand are PLEASURES FOR EVERMORE." (Ps. 16: 11.)

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.*" (John 14: 2, 3.) "We shall ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 17.) "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, YE BLESSED *of my Father*, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25: 34.)

"*Blessed* and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." (Rev. 20: 6.)

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, *and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be* NO MORE DEATH, *neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain*, for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21: 3, 4.)

What a magnificent destiny awaits the faithful follower of Christ! To be forever with the Lord; to share in the pure pleasures of the angels; to be forever free from all pain and sorrow; to be assured that perfect peace will never be disturbed by the corroding cares of mortal life—all this will be inexpressibly glorious!

If a righteous man has even in this world, while fully trusting

in God, a "peace which passeth all understanding," what pencil can paint, or pen portray the beatific vision which shall unfold to his enraptured gaze, when admitted to the new heavens and new earth, he beholds the glory of his Redeemer, and is permitted to share in the perpetual pleasures of the Paradise of God? In that bright world, sickness and sorrow, disease and death, will be unknown. There will be no mourners there to weep over the sad ravages of the king of terrors, "for God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be *no more death.*"

This glorious promise made by him whose word is truth, leads to the remark that the Scriptures not only represent Christ as the giver of 'life,' but also as the destroyer of death. Coeval with the entrance of sin into the world was the promise that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.[1] And the apostle John says:

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (1 John 3: 8.)

The language of the author of the epistle to the Hebrews is still more explicit:

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he *might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*" (ch. 2: 24.)

"He will swallow up *death* in victory." (Is. 25: 8.)

"*The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*" (1 Cor. 15: 26.)

"And death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." (Rev. 20: 14.)

Only one question remains—What is meant by the expression 'death shall be destroyed?' The 'second death' is, in the Orthodox vocabulary, called "eternal death," and is defined to be "the death that never dies." Hence the expression is spiritualized to read, "the last enemy that shall be endlessly preserved is death." But how contrary would such an interpretation be to reason as well as to revelation! Who does not know that death will never be destroyed so long as he has *living victims* to prey upon? We can never understand what is meant by death being the last enemy that shall be destroyed so long as we define eternal *death* to mean eternal life in misery. When death "is swallowed up in victory," and "*mortality* is swallowed up of LIFE," *then will death be destroyed.* Then "the Most High shall appear upon the seat of judgment, and misery shall pass away, and the long-suffering shall have an end." (2 Esd. 7: 33.)

[1] Literally, "*crush* the serpent's head."

The Orthodox interpretation of the words 'life' and 'death' is an outrage upon human reason, and a reflection upon the character of God. It deprives our glorious Redeemer of the honor of dispensing immortality to his faithful subjects; and disguises under the sentence of death a life of interminable wo.

So long as men feel that they are already immortal, so long will they be unable to realize the great central fact of the Gospel, that Christ is the *Life-giver*, and that he is coming the second time to confer immortality upon all who truly love and obey him.

Why is it that the doctrine of Christ's second advent is so unpopular among modern Christians? Is it not because they fail to realize the great object of his coming? Orthodoxy confidently proclaims that "death is the Prince of peace," and the usher of the happy soul to the realms of glory. It is plain that if Christians believe that they shall go to Christ in heaven when they die, they will not expect him to come to earth again, unless it be in a spiritual manner. Christ said, "I am come that ye might have *life.*" And again, "Ye will not come TO ME that ye might have LIFE." But Orthodoxy only seems to hear that other voice, "Ye shall not surely die;" and turns away with the virtual response: "We already have *life*, IMMORTAL LIFE. We will accept *happiness* at thy hands, but we have all the *life* that we need."

The language of Scripture is, "*When* Christ who is our life shall appear, *then* shall *ye also appear* with him in glory." Our Lord taught his disciples that he would come to *them*, *not* that they should go to him.

The hour is surely coming, nor can it be far distant, when he who is the Resurrection and the Life will come to bestow the priceless pearl of immortality upon all who have sought for it by patient continuance in well doing. (Rom. 2: 6, 7.) Then "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." (Is. 35: 10.)

UMI

in God, a "peace which passeth all understanding," what pencil can paint, or pen portray the beatific vision which shall unfold to his enraptured gaze, when admitted to the new heavens and new earth, he beholds the glory of his Redeemer, and is permitted to share in the perpetual pleasures of the Paradise of God? In that bright world, sickness and sorrow, disease and death, will be unknown. There will be no mourners there to weep over the sad ravages of the king of terrors, "for God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be *no more death.*"

This glorious promise made by him whose word is truth, leads to the remark that the Scriptures not only represent Christ as the giver of 'life,' but also as the destroyer of death. Coeval with the entrance of sin into the world was the promise that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.[1] And the apostle John says:

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (1 John 3: 8.)

The language of the author of the epistle to the Hebrews is still more explicit:

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he *might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*" (ch. 2: 24.)

"He will swallow up *death* in victory." (Is. 25: 8.)

"*The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*" (1 Cor. 15: 26.)

"And death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." (Rev. 20: 14.)

Only one question remains—What is meant by the expression 'death shall be destroyed?' The 'second death' is, in the Orthodox vocabulary, called "eternal death," and is defined to be "the death that never dies." Hence the expression is spiritualized to read, "the last enemy that shall be endlessly preserved is death." But how contrary would such an interpretation be to reason as well as to revelation! Who does not know that death will never be destroyed so long as he has *living victims* to prey upon? We can never understand what is meant by death being the last enemy that shall be destroyed so long as we define eternal *death* to mean eternal life in misery. When death "is swallowed up in victory," and "*mortality* is swallowed up of LIFE," *then will death be destroyed.* Then "the Most High shall appear upon the seat of judgment, and misery shall pass away, and the long-suffering shall have an end." (2 Esd. 7: 33.)

[1] Literally, "*crush* the serpent's head."

The Orthodox interpretation of the words 'life' and 'death' is an outrage upon human reason, and a reflection upon the character of God. It deprives our glorious Redeemer of the honor of dispensing immortality to his faithful subjects; and disguises under the sentence of death a life of interminable wo.

So long as men feel that they are already immortal, so long will they be unable to realize the great central fact of the Gospel, that Christ is the *Life-giver*, and that he is coming the second time to confer immortality upon all who truly love and obey him.

Why is it that the doctrine of Christ's second advent is so unpopular among modern Christians? Is it not because they fail to realize the great object of his coming? Orthodoxy confidently proclaims that "death is the Prince of peace," and the usher of the happy soul to the realms of glory. It is plain that if Christians believe that they shall go to Christ in heaven when they die, they will not expect him to come to earth again, unless it be in a spiritual manner. Christ said, "I am come that ye might have *life.*" And again, "Ye will not come TO ME that ye might have LIFE." But Orthodoxy only seems to hear that other voice, "Ye shall not surely die;" and turns away with the virtual response: "We already have *life*, IMMORTAL LIFE. We will accept *happiness* at thy hands, but we have all the *life* that we need."

The language of Scripture is, "*When* Christ who is our life shall appear, *then* shall *ye also appear* with him in glory." Our Lord taught his disciples that he would come to *them*, *not* that they should go to him.

The hour is surely coming, nor can it be far distant, when he who is the Resurrection and the Life will come to bestow the priceless pearl of immortality upon all who have sought for it by patient continuance in well doing. (Rom. 2: 6, 7.) Then "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." (Is. 35: 10.)

UMI

THE SIGNS.

THE NIGHT COMETH! Nor does it seem far off. It never appeared so nigh. The shadows are lengthening out, and falling with ominous gloom upon the valleys of earth. The dimness of twilight is beginning to make itself felt. It is settling down drearily upon our cities, and on our solitudes; upon the towers of our strength and the palaces of our pomp: nor can the noisy rush of eager multitudes hurrying to and fro for gain or pleasure wholly stifle the utterance of fear and awe. Men cannot help foreboding evil, for who can tell them what may be in the womb of darkness! The night-birds are already on the wing, flitting around us, and reminding us of the descending night.

Yet it is written also, "The day is at hand!" The night, though dark, is brief, and is soon succeeded by a glorious day. But still of that day the night is the forerunner. And this world's night is surely near. Else, why so many indications of closing day?

But has it not been always thus? Have not other ages as well as the present been equally crowded with signs of trouble? Have not certain men always loved to be prophets of evil, and to interpret gloomily the events of their day? Is there not among many a morbid and unhealthy love of the dark and the ominous?

Be it so. It will not, however, be denied that the time must come when the crisis will arrive; and that before its arrival, it will give notice of its approach by casting its shadows before. If such a crisis remains yet to be realized, then some age or other must be its precursor—must lie next the precipice, and see with its own eyes the gulf below. It is right, no doubt, that we should be cautious, not misdating events, nor miscalculating times, nor misjudging signs; but it is far safer to take swift alarm at what seem like tokens of evil, even though the alarm should prove false, than with incredulous, it may be derisive, skepticism, to reject every sign, and refuse to be forewarned. It is bad, certainly, to be taking needless alarm; but it is incredibly worse to deny that we ought to take alarm at all, as if the day of the Lord would never really come, but was a mere empty name, hung over us for terror, age after age, as a check upon the world and a stimulus to the Church. If, then, that day be a certainty, a reality, who will affirm that, when about to arrive, it will not foreshow itself? Surely a dislike to give heed to the forebodings of judgment must arise from a dislike to entertain even the thought of that crisis. We will not see in the events of the day premonitory shocks of the last earthquake, because we would fain discredit or postpone that day of calamity and terror.

This is not wisdom. Neither is it magnanimity. It is folly; it is littleness of soul. It is a reckless resolution to blind ourselves to the evil as long as possible, and then to brave it, as best we may, when it does burst upon us. Or, there may be the secret thought beneath, "What if it should never come at all? What if we have colored the future with the gloom of our own fancies? What if the world is destined to pass through no such hurricane? What if we are to flow gently on into a fairer region, and a holier era, as winter dissolves itself softly into spring, or as spring expands itself into the brilliance of summer? At least the evil will not come in our day; we need not, then, vainly distract and alarm ourselves before the time."

But how have we discovered that the Lord will not come in our day? How have we ascertained that these signs, on which so many eyes are fixed, are delusive? Has God revealed it to us? Or, are we but guessing? Are we announcing as certain what we merely *wish* to be true? Why should it not come in our time? If it is to come in some age of the world, why not in ours? Who are we that we should affirm concerning our age, that no evil shall come nigh it? Is there a spell upon our generation, that the evil cannot touch it, but must be charmed onward to another? Has the enlightenment of the day reared such an embankment round it that no flood can assail or overflow it? This, surely, is the security of fatalism. It is the dream of unbelief, or the opiate of worldliness, that is resolved to sleep on, unawakened by the unwelcome sound of threatening danger. If it be foolish to be always foreboding evil, it is worse than foolish to be recklessly closing the eye against the tokens of it, however numerously they may crowd upon us.

It may be said that these forebodings have so often been shamed and discredited, that we are justified in giving no heed to them. In every age some have taken the alarm, and have been the prophets of evil that has never arrived. I do not deny this; neither do I wish to hide it. But what of this? Were they not wise men who took the earliest alarm, even though their fears were not realized? They read evil in the signs of the times, and they gave utterance to the feelings of their hearts, that their fellow-men might be aroused. This was not folly, neither was it weakness. It was true wisdom. They painted, perhaps, the signs darker than they really were. They drew more out of them than they were intended to prognosticate. And so, what was dreaded did not come to pass. Yet who will say that they were not truly wise, even though their alarm was premature—far wiser than those who read nothing in those signs at all? Such men have often been derided as gloomy enthusiasts, who sought to cloud the mirth of a happy world, and whose failure was the meet reward for their presumptuous folly. Yet folly was not with them. They might be sad and solemn, but they were not men of gloom or sternness. They had hearts as warm and true as ever throbbed within a human breast. It was

THE SIGNS.

THE NIGHT COMETH! Nor does it seem far off. It never appeared so nigh. The shadows are lengthening out, and falling with ominous gloom upon the valleys of earth. The dimness of twilight is beginning to make itself felt. It is settling down drearily upon our cities, and on our solitudes; upon the towers of our strength and the palaces of our pomp: nor can the noisy rush of eager multitudes hurrying to and fro for gain or pleasure wholly stifle the utterance of fear and awe. Men cannot help foreboding evil, for who can tell them what may be in the womb of darkness! The night-birds are already on the wing, flitting around us, and reminding us of the descending night.

Yet it is written also, "The day is at hand!" The night, though dark, is brief, and is soon succeeded by a glorious day. But still of that day the night is the forerunner. And this world's night is surely near. Else, why so many indications of closing day?

But has it not been always thus? Have not other ages as well as the present been equally crowded with signs of trouble? Have not certain men always loved to be prophets of evil, and to interpret gloomily the events of their day? Is there not among many a morbid and unhealthy love of the dark and the ominous?

Be it so. It will not, however, be denied that the time must come when the crisis will arrive; and that before its arrival, it will give notice of its approach by casting its shadows before. If such a crisis remains yet to be realized, then some age or other must be its precursor—must lie next the precipice, and see with its own eyes the gulf below. It is right, no doubt, that we should be cautious, not misdating events, nor miscalculating times, nor misjudging signs; but it is far safer to take swift alarm at what seem like tokens of evil, even though the alarm should prove false, than with incredulous, it may be derisive, skepticism, to reject every sign, and refuse to be forewarned. It is bad, certainly, to be taking needless alarm; but it is incredibly worse to deny that we ought to take alarm at all, as if the day of the Lord would never really come, but was a mere empty name, hung over us for terror, age after age, as a check upon the world and a stimulus to the Church. If, then, that day be a certainty, a reality, who will affirm that, when about to arrive, it will not foreshow itself? Surely a dislike to give heed to the forebodings of judgment must arise from a dislike to entertain even the thought of that crisis. We will not see in the events of the day premonitory shocks of the last earthquake, because we would fain discredit or postpone that day of calamity and terror.

This is not wisdom. Neither is it magnanimity. It is folly; it is littleness of soul. It is a reckless resolution to blind ourselves to the evil as long as possible, and then to brave it, as best we may, when it does burst upon us. Or, there may be the secret thought beneath, "What if it should never come at all? What if we have colored the future with the gloom of our own fancies? What if the world is destined to pass through no such hurricane? What if we are to flow gently on into a fairer region, and a holier era, as winter dissolves itself softly into spring, or as spring expands itself into the brilliance of summer? At least the evil will not come in our day; we need not, then, vainly distract and alarm ourselves before the time."

But how have we discovered that the Lord will not come in our day? How have we ascertained that these signs, on which so many eyes are fixed, are delusive? Has God revealed it to us? Or, are we but guessing? Are we announcing as certain what we merely *wish* to be true? Why should it not come in our time? If it is to come in some age of the world, why not in ours? Who are we that we should affirm concerning our age, that no evil shall come nigh it? Is there a spell upon our generation, that the evil cannot touch it, but must be charmed onward to another? Has the enlightenment of the day reared such an embankment round it that no flood can assail or overflow it? This, surely, is the security of fatalism. It is the dream of unbelief, or the opiate of worldliness, that is resolved to sleep on, unawakened by the unwelcome sound of threatening danger. If it be foolish to be always foreboding evil, it is worse than foolish to be recklessly closing the eye against the tokens of it, however numerously they may crowd upon us.

It may be said that these forebodings have so often been shamed and discredited, that we are justified in giving no heed to them. In every age some have taken the alarm, and have been the prophets of evil that has never arrived. I do not deny this; neither do I wish to hide it. But what of this? Were they not wise men who took the earliest alarm, even though their fears were not realized? They read evil in the signs of the times, and they gave utterance to the feelings of their hearts, that their fellow-men might be aroused. This was not folly, neither was it weakness. It was true wisdom. They painted, perhaps, the signs darker than they really were. They drew more out of them than they were intended to prognosticate. And so, what was dreaded did not come to pass. Yet who will say that they were not truly wise, even though their alarm was premature—far wiser than those who read nothing in those signs at all? Such men have often been derided as gloomy enthusiasts, who sought to cloud the mirth of a happy world, and whose failure was the meet reward for their presumptuous folly. Yet folly was not with them. They might be sad and solemn, but they were not men of gloom or sternness. They had hearts as warm and true as ever throbbed within a human breast. It was

not misanthropy; it was love—love to a heedless world rushing on to judgment unprepared, that drew forth their deep and awful utterances. It was rejected warnings that made them sad, and fain to hide their thoughts within their bosoms, if love would have allowed it, if yearnings over dying multitudes had not constrained them to speak.

Notwithstanding, then, all the objections that are urged against interpreting the signs of the times, I shall, however briefly and imperfectly, make the attempt. Our Lord reproved the Pharisees for *not* doing this; and, having left us so many signs of his coming, will he hold us guiltless if we refuse to consider these, and prepare for his arrival? Those that object to our doing this, would not find fault with us if we would only so interpret the signs as to throw the advent into the distance; that is to say, they admit the propriety of interpreting providential occurrences in some way or other: they cannot, therefore, consistently censure us for *attempting* the interpretation; they can only maintain that our interpretation is faulty and unproved.

The signs which have been given us, both by the Lord and his apostles, are as notable as they are numerous. And it is very evident that those have been selected which were the most expressive and least ambiguous. They are chosen as being the most prominent and explicit that could be given. It cannot be thought that the least striking have been announced, and the most striking concealed. If so, then is it not very remarkable that the millennium is never mentioned as a sign at all? Had this been to take place before the advent, how has it never been alluded to as one of the signs? It would have been by far the most distinct and visible. No one could overlook or mistake it. Yet nowhere, by prophets or apostles, or by the Lord himself, is it noted as a sign. How can this be accounted for, save upon the ground that it was to take place *after*, not *before* the advent? If this be admitted, all is plain; if it be denied, then let those who deny it account for the fact, that among the many signs of the coming the millennium is never mentioned as one. *Why* the most palpable of them all should be omitted, seems to me to require an explanation. On the post-millennial system, the omission seems to me inexplicable; for thus our Lord would be made to profess to tell us the signs of his appearing, and yet to conceal the most notable of them all. But this is not all. The signs which are given are inconsistent with the idea of a millennium before the coming. It is not merely that a certain event is not mentioned, but that those events which are mentioned preclude the possibility of such an event lying concealed among them. Who that reads the Lord's prophecy, which begins with the destruction of Jerusalem, and ends with his appearing in the clouds of heaven, does not feel that the whole drift of it was to show the Church that she was to expect sorrow, not joy, tribulation, not triumph, up till the time when he should return? These signs

were the successive crests of the billows on which she was to be tossed, till he, with his own voice and presence, should rebuke the tempest and calm the ocean. The simple *omission*, then, of the millennium as a sign, is a fact on which we ought to lay much stress; but the omission of it, in circumstances which preclude the possibility of its being a thing reserved or merely unspoken, furnishes a strong argument in favor of a pre-millennial advent.

But without further adverting to this point, let me now note some of the signs which in the present day seem most remarkable as forerunners of the Lord's appearing. And though of some of these it might be said that they have been found in former days, yet others of them, as we shall see, are peculiar to our own.

1. *The diffusion of Infidelity.*—This at least is new. Our fathers knew comparatively little of this, and our fathers' fathers almost nothing. An infidel was rare indeed in their day; a man wondered at and shunned. Towards the close of the last century, infidelity burst forth in France, and partially extended itself elsewhere. Of late years it has developed itself with prodigious swiftness, and assumed a bold and lofty attitude of assault. Its extent is incredible. The masses are thoroughly leavened with it. It has insinuated itself everywhere, and is eating out the very heart of everything like deep principle among men. It has corroded the cement by which society clings together, so that nations and communities are now like walls or towers without mortar, ready to fall to pieces of themselves, or be levelled by the first blast. Its ferocity is alarming; its activity unceasing. Much of it is undisguised and confessed, but very much of it is still secret and unavowed. It taints the air; it blights life; it ossifies conscience; under it, all good things wither. It is the worm at the root of all that is noble and excellent in these last days. Hence the *hollow* condition of things amongst us; the chill that is upon life's warm fellowships and offices of love. Conscience is palsied; the *heart* of the people is gone. Social, political, kindred ties are worm-eaten, and ready to break asunder. The erect bearing and manly vigor which religion imparts is no longer visible. Superstition has come to the rescue, and is trying to supply its place. But in vain. Expediency rules. Large masses of the people are either openly or secretly infidel, if not atheistical. God is not acknowledged. His yoke seems to gall men's shoulders. The nations are ready to cast it off. And what hope is there, what token, that this is to end before the Lord's return to end it?

2. *The increase of immorality.*—Like a flood it is swelling and widening in its course. It is without shame, and without fear. Truth is fast going out of human language; confidence between man and man is leaving human life; friendships are bare and

not misanthropy; it was love—love to a heedless world rushing on to judgment unprepared, that drew forth their deep and awful utterances. It was rejected warnings that made them sad, and fain to hide their thoughts within their bosoms, if love would have allowed it, if yearnings over dying multitudes had not constrained them to speak.

Notwithstanding, then, all the objections that are urged against interpreting the signs of the times, I shall, however briefly and imperfectly, make the attempt. Our Lord reproved the Pharisees for *not* doing this; and, having left us so many signs of his coming, will he hold us guiltless if we refuse to consider these, and prepare for his arrival? Those that object to our doing this, would not find fault with us if we would only so interpret the signs as to throw the advent into the distance; that is to say, they admit the propriety of interpreting providential occurrences in some way or other: they cannot, therefore, consistently censure us for *attempting* the interpretation; they can only maintain that our interpretation is faulty and unproved.

The signs which have been given us, both by the Lord and his apostles, are as notable as they are numerous. And it is very evident that those have been selected which were the most expressive and least ambiguous. They are chosen as being the most prominent and explicit that could be given. It cannot be thought that the least striking have been announced, and the most striking concealed. If so, then is it not very remarkable that the millennium is never mentioned as a sign at all? Had this been to take place before the advent, how has it never been alluded to as one of the signs? It would have been by far the most distinct and visible. No one could overlook or mistake it. Yet nowhere, by prophets or apostles, or by the Lord himself, is it noted as a sign. How can this be accounted for, save upon the ground that it was to take place *after*, not *before* the advent? If this be admitted, all is plain; if it be denied, then let those who deny it account for the fact, that among the many signs of the coming the millennium is never mentioned as one. *Why* the most palpable of them all should be omitted, seems to me to require an explanation. On the post-millennial system, the omission seems to me inexplicable; for thus our Lord would be made to profess to tell us the signs of his appearing, and yet to conceal the most notable of them all. But this is not all. The signs which are given are inconsistent with the idea of a millennium before the coming. It is not merely that a certain event is not mentioned, but that those events which are mentioned preclude the possibility of such an event lying concealed among them. Who that reads the Lord's prophecy, which begins with the destruction of Jerusalem, and ends with his appearing in the clouds of heaven, does not feel that the whole drift of it was to show the Church that she was to expect sorrow, not joy, tribulation, not triumph, up till the time when he should return? These signs

were the successive crests of the billows on which she was to be tossed, till he, with his own voice and presence, should rebuke the tempest and calm the ocean. The simple *omission*, then, of the millennium as a sign, is a fact on which we ought to lay much stress; but the omission of it, in circumstances which preclude the possibility of its being a thing reserved or merely unspoken, furnishes a strong argument in favor of a pre-millennial advent.

But without further adverting to this point, let me now note some of the signs which in the present day seem most remarkable as forerunners of the Lord's appearing. And though of some of these it might be said that they have been found in former days, yet others of them, as we shall see, are peculiar to our own.

1. *The diffusion of Infidelity.*—This at least is new. Our fathers knew comparatively little of this, and our fathers' fathers almost nothing. An infidel was rare indeed in their day; a man wondered at and shunned. Towards the close of the last century, infidelity burst forth in France, and partially extended itself elsewhere. Of late years it has developed itself with prodigious swiftness, and assumed a bold and lofty attitude of assault. Its extent is incredible. The masses are thoroughly leavened with it. It has insinuated itself everywhere, and is eating out the very heart of everything like deep principle among men. It has corroded the cement by which society clings together, so that nations and communities are now like walls or towers without mortar, ready to fall to pieces of themselves, or be levelled by the first blast. Its ferocity is alarming; its activity unceasing. Much of it is undisguised and confessed, but very much of it is still secret and unavowed. It taints the air; it blights life; it ossifies conscience; under it, all good things wither. It is the worm at the root of all that is noble and excellent in these last days. Hence the *hollow* condition of things amongst us; the chill that is upon life's warm fellowships and offices of love. Conscience is palsied; the *heart* of the people is gone. Social, political, kindred ties are worm-eaten, and ready to break asunder. The erect bearing and manly vigor which religion imparts is no longer visible. Superstition has come to the rescue, and is trying to supply its place. But in vain. Expediency rules. Large masses of the people are either openly or secretly infidel, if not atheistical. God is not acknowledged. His yoke seems to gall men's shoulders. The nations are ready to cast it off. And what hope is there, what token, that this is to end before the Lord's return to end it?

2. *The increase of immorality.*—Like a flood it is swelling and widening in its course. It is without shame, and without fear. Truth is fast going out of human language; confidence between man and man is leaving human life; friendships are bare and

empty, little more than selfish conveniences; even oaths are frail—in most cases forms, in many, mockeries—

> "And, clad like honesties, the falsehoods move
> Along the world."

Conscience is gone: tenderness of spirit is known only in our works of fiction; noble-mindedness is to be found only on the monuments of the dead. The heart of the nation, nay, of the world, has been tampered with and vitiated, till it is ready for almost any excess of evil: the life-blood is tainted, and hence the loathsome sores that are breaking forth, betokening the depth and virulence of the taint—"the ineradicable taint of sin." Crimes that our fathers knew not of are common among the nations. Licentiousness riots fearfully, perpetrating deeds without a name, so that "it is a shame even to speak of those things that are done of them in secret." Drunkenness staggers along every street. Blasphemy pours itself forth, till we shudder, and close the ear against its horrid sounds. Murder has broken loose, and every day our newspapers are telling some horrid tale of bloodshed; man slaying his fellow-man, in fiendish hatred, or more fiendish love of gain; none spared; the parent butchering his children, the child his parent, the husband the wife, the wife the husband: no sanctity of relationship is any safeguard from the poison, or the bullet, or the knife, or the more brutal hammer. Oh! what a cry is going up to heaven from this land of ours; the cry of innocent blood—blood which a righteous God will yet avenge! But the picture of our spreading immorality is one not easily drawn, save by the record of *facts*—facts which one man scarcely ventures to whisper to another, too awful to be laid bare before the public eye. It calls for a prophet's eye to see it, a prophet's pen to record it, and a prophet's soul to weep over it "in secret places" before the Lord. Men are truly lovers of their ownselves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." All this is to come to pass in the last days, and to wax worse and worse till the Lord come.

3. *The prevalence of superficialty and formalism in religion.*—Form without power, a body without a soul, religion without vitality; these are among the signs of the last days. The show of piety is widespread, but the thing itself occupies a narrow circle. There is much profession, but profession lies on the surface, and underneath all may be worldliness. Depth and solidity are wanting; the aspect of religion is unhealthy; the fresh hue of primitive times departed; the intense vitality which of right belongs to it, is dried up; so that, instead of its being the living source of motion to the world without, controlling, or counteracting, or impelling its currents, it lies inert and passive, at the

mercy of every outward movement. It is a worldly, self-pleasing religion, adopted for fashion's sake, and used according to convenience. We look in vain for the profound sense of sin, the simple faith which the Church once manifested, the solemn, unearthly walk which she once pursued. We are mere imitators of godliness; we "steal our words one from another." Hence we are driven about with every wind of doctrine, having no stability, no anchorage, save that which the inertness of death affords.

Satan has now transformed himself into an angel of light, and under this fair disguise he is working with marvelous success. He is teaching us to build the tombs of our fathers, that we may rest content with the mere approbation of their principles without any imitation of their practice. He leads some astray into fatal error under the pretext of candor and love of truth; others he saturates with the orthodoxy of the head, that they may become indifferent to their state of heart before God. Some he persuades to deny the Bible; to others he lauds it, that he may make it a substitute for the God of the Bible. He cries up faith, that he may set it as substitute for the object of faith. With some he denies the possibility of assurance, that he may keep them from peace with God; with others he maintains the necessity of it, only in order that he may lead them to make a god of it, and substitute their being sure of salvation for believing in the Savior. He cries down the Arminianism of making works our Savior, that he may lead us into the more subtle delusion of making a Savior of our faith. He allows us a wide range of religious feeling and sentiment, if he can only succeed in making them a substitute for God. He hinders not our being serious, earnest, solemn, if he can thereby feed the cravings of a restless, empty soul with something which may prevent us from seeking the bread of life. He permits us to denounce the world's vanity and hollow pleasures; to be weary of its unsatisfying round of folly, that he may delude us into the idea that this dissatisfaction with the world is a proof that we are religious, and thereby cause us to sit down contented, when yet a great way off from our Father's house. He tolerates the circulation of useful, nay, of religious knowledge, that we may rest satisfied with something short of the fullness of God himself. He may countenance, too, the routine of religious societies or Church courts, and the false excitement of crowded assemblies, eloquent speeches, glowing reports, that he may administer thereby that opiate to the soul by which it may be kept in a delusive day-dream, which seems so like "the sober certainty of waking bliss," that we cannot think of breaking the luxury of the pleasant spell. He inculcates the necessity of providing for our children what is called a liberal education, that he may make that a substitute for a father's blessing and a mother's prayers. He urges the obligation of Christian liberality, the necessity of large funds, that he may

empty, little more than selfish conveniences; even oaths are frail—in most cases forms, in many, mockeries—

> "And, clad like honesties, the falsehoods move
> Along the world."

Conscience is gone: tenderness of spirit is known only in our works of fiction; noble-mindedness is to be found only on the monuments of the dead. The heart of the nation, nay, of the world, has been tampered with and vitiated, till it is ready for almost any excess of evil: the life-blood is tainted, and hence the loathsome sores that are breaking forth, betokening the depth and virulence of the taint—"the ineradicable taint of sin." Crimes that our fathers knew not of are common among the nations. Licentiousness riots fearfully, perpetrating deeds without a name, so that "it is a shame even to speak of those things that are done of them in secret." Drunkenness staggers along every street. Blasphemy pours itself forth, till we shudder, and close the ear against its horrid sounds. Murder has broken loose, and every day our newspapers are telling some horrid tale of bloodshed; man slaying his fellow-man, in fiendish hatred, or more fiendish love of gain; none spared; the parent butchering his children, the child his parent, the husband the wife, the wife the husband: no sanctity of relationship is any safeguard from the poison, or the bullet, or the knife, or the more brutal hammer. Oh! what a cry is going up to heaven from this land of ours; the cry of innocent blood—blood which a righteous God will yet avenge! But the picture of our spreading immorality is one not easily drawn, save by the record of *facts*—facts which one man scarcely ventures to whisper to another, too awful to be laid bare before the public eye. It calls for a prophet's eye to see it, a prophet's pen to record it, and a prophet's soul to weep over it "in secret places" before the Lord. Men are truly lovers of their ownselves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." All this is to come to pass in the last days, and to wax worse and worse till the Lord come.

3. *The prevalence of superficialty and formalism in religion.*—Form without power, a body without a soul, religion without vitality; these are among the signs of the last days. The show of piety is widespread, but the thing itself occupies a narrow circle. There is much profession, but profession lies on the surface, and underneath all may be worldliness. Depth and solidity are wanting; the aspect of religion is unhealthy; the fresh hue of primitive times departed; the intense vitality which of right belongs to it, is dried up; so that, instead of its being the living source of motion to the world without, controlling, or counteracting, or impelling its currents, it lies inert and passive, at the

mercy of every outward movement. It is a worldly, self-pleasing religion, adopted for fashion's sake, and used according to convenience. We look in vain for the profound sense of sin, the simple faith which the Church once manifested, the solemn, unearthly walk which she once pursued. We are mere imitators of godliness; we "steal our words one from another." Hence we are driven about with every wind of doctrine, having no stability, no anchorage, save that which the inertness of death affords.

Satan has now transformed himself into an angel of light, and under this fair disguise he is working with marvelous success. He is teaching us to build the tombs of our fathers, that we may rest content with the mere approbation of their principles without any imitation of their practice. He leads some astray into fatal error under the pretext of candor and love of truth; others he saturates with the orthodoxy of the head, that they may become indifferent to their state of heart before God. Some he persuades to deny the Bible; to others he lauds it, that he may make it a substitute for the God of the Bible. He cries up faith, that he may set it as substitute for the object of faith. With some he denies the possibility of assurance, that he may keep them from peace with God; with others he maintains the necessity of it, only in order that he may lead them to make a god of it, and substitute their being sure of salvation for believing in the Savior. He cries down the Arminianism of making works our Savior, that he may lead us into the more subtle delusion of making a Savior of our faith. He allows us a wide range of religious feeling and sentiment, if he can only succeed in making them a substitute for God. He hinders not our being serious, earnest, solemn, if he can thereby feed the cravings of a restless, empty soul with something which may prevent us from seeking the bread of life. He permits us to denounce the world's vanity and hollow pleasures; to be weary of its unsatisfying round of folly, that he may delude us into the idea that this dissatisfaction with the world is a proof that we are religious, and thereby cause us to sit down contented, when yet a great way off from our Father's house. He tolerates the circulation of useful, nay, of religious knowledge, that we may rest satisfied with something short of the fullness of God himself. He may countenance, too, the routine of religious societies or Church courts, and the false excitement of crowded assemblies, eloquent speeches, glowing reports, that he may administer thereby that opiate to the soul by which it may be kept in a delusive day-dream, which seems so like "the sober certainty of waking bliss," that we cannot think of breaking the luxury of the pleasant spell. He inculcates the necessity of providing for our children what is called a liberal education, that he may make that a substitute for a father's blessing and a mother's prayers. He urges the obligation of Christian liberality, the necessity of large funds, that he may

bring men to rest religious enterprise upon funds, not upon faith —upon prudence, not on prayer.

These outward things may be in themselves right and good, but what are they without the indwelling Spirit? What is truth without the True One? What is the perfection of Church order without the vital power from above? The body is there, but the living spirit has fled; the altar and the sacrifice are there, but the fire from heaven descends not; the temple is perfect, and the worshipers are thronging its courts, but the glory is departed; Jehovah has left his shrine!

4. *The strange and incongruous mixture of opinions that prevails.* —Men's imaginations seem to be let loose in every direction in inventing these; science, philosophy, literature, theology, are all shooting forth a rank luxuriance of verdure, which is even already producing a harvest of incongruous opinions. The crudities that are often issuing forth under sanction of these venerable names are such as to make one at times tremble lest truth itself should be drifting from her anchorage. These are the "unclean spirits like frogs, which proceed out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet." They are well said to be "like frogs;" in themselves croaking, contemptible agencies, yet insinuating themselves everywhere, and defiling all places, even the most sacred, with their loathsomeness, and annoying the general ear with their incessant, unmeaning noise. These are they whom Satan is now sending forth, in this the cloudy dusk of the world's declining day, to form a triple alliance between powers hitherto at war with each other, animating them by one spirit to fight against the Lord and his anointed. Of these are the thousand organs of the infidel press, sending abroad its croaking progeny and leavening the nations with the subtle poison of its atheistical politics, and the damnable delusions of its pantheistical theology: from the contamination of whose foul principles (as in Egypt during the plague of frogs) none but God's chosen Israel shall be exempt; for "they shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect." And when is it that these spirits of devils "go forth to the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty?" It is just before the advent. They have been going forth already, and are still going forth: and they shall continue their horrid work of gathering the nations into their great slaughter-house, till the Lord come; for it is added immediately, "Behold, I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments." (Rev. 16: 15.)

5. *Dissociality.*—The coherence of the whole social system is very precarious. Nay, the coherence of its minute component parts, its communities, its neighborhoods, its families, is very slight indeed; if, indeed, it may not be said to be already loosed and dissevered. It is as if our very atmosphere possessed a decomposing power. The cement of society has at length given

way to the corrosive influence of wickedness. Man's native selfishness is in the ascendant. It has burst over its restraints, and is now triumphing. Melancholy triumph for the world! for with it all that is fair and goodly, all that is large-hearted and loving, all that binds us to each other in charity and brotherhood, all that is generous and disinterested, must ere long utterly decay. The world is at length breaking up. Like a stranded vessel over which sea after sea has been driving, it can no longer hold together. Its timbers are parting, and it will soon be a total wreck. God meant the human family to be but one household, knit together in love and brotherhood as well as blood. There has been little enough of this true oneness hitherto; but still there has been some. But now it is disappearing. The family, instead of being like a compact rock, close-knit in all its parts, is fast becoming a mere mound of sand, whose particles have no cohesion, no union, save that of casual, temporary nearness, and whose mass the first springtide will level and sweep away. *Self* is now in full maturity and action. Suspicion of each other is one of the rules of life. It is not possible that the social fabric can cling long together. And who shall *recement* it? Who shall restore the lost unity, and reproduce the vanished confidence? He who comes to make all things new. Things have been allowed to fall into decay, and to continue to crumble down, atom by atom, till he should come, that his should be the glory of remodeling and reconstructing the fallen fabric; and that his might be through eternity the praise, not only of bringing a redeemed Church through death to resurrection-life, and perfection, but of bringing creation through decay and ruin to restitution-life, stability, and comeliness.

6. *Wars and rumors of wars, earthquakes, pestilences, and famines in divers places.*—I need not enter minutely into the proof of the existence of these. The news of every week may bear witness to it. For a while it seemed almost as if the world were at rest, as if its storms had spent themselves. But now all seems changed. Every day brings new indications of disquietude and convulsion. In every region—continent or island, wilderness or fruitful plain—there are wars and rumors of wars, famines, pestilences, earthquakes. Few nations seem willing to draw the sword, yet every nation has her hand upon the hilt; with some it is already gleaming in the air, and with others it is reddened with blood. Over the whole earth is heard "the long, low, distant murmur of dread sound." And is not this the prelude to the last universal war? Is it not a sign of the near approach of him who, when earth's madness and ambition are at their hight—when the summoned nations are gathered at Armageddon, girt for battle and slaughter, himself appears for their discomfiture and ruin? Then, but not till then, wars shall cease, and the weapons of war perish. Then the true Solomon shall begin his reign, hushing the tumults of the nations, and

UMI

bring men to rest religious enterprise upon funds, not upon faith —upon prudence, not on prayer.

These outward things may be in themselves right and good, but what are they without the indwelling Spirit? What is truth without the True One? What is the perfection of Church order without the vital power from above? The body is there, but the living spirit has fled; the altar and the sacrifice are there, but the fire from heaven descends not; the temple is perfect, and the worshipers are thronging its courts, but the glory is departed; Jehovah has left his shrine!

4. *The strange and incongruous mixture of opinions that prevails.* —Men's imaginations seem to be let loose in every direction in inventing these; science, philosophy, literature, theology, are all shooting forth a rank luxuriance of verdure, which is even already producing a harvest of incongruous opinions. The crudities that are often issuing forth under sanction of these venerable names are such as to make one at times tremble lest truth itself should be drifting from her anchorage. These are the "unclean spirits like frogs, which proceed out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet." They are well said to be "like frogs;" in themselves croaking, contemptible agencies, yet insinuating themselves everywhere, and defiling all places, even the most sacred, with their loathsomeness, and annoying the general ear with their incessant, unmeaning noise. These are they whom Satan is now sending forth, in this the cloudy dusk of the world's declining day, to form a triple alliance between powers hitherto at war with each other, animating them by one spirit to fight against the Lord and his anointed. Of these are the thousand organs of the infidel press, sending abroad its croaking progeny and leavening the nations with the subtle poison of its atheistical politics, and the damnable delusions of its pantheistical theology: from the contamination of whose foul principles (as in Egypt during the plague of frogs) none but God's chosen Israel shall be exempt; for "they shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect." And when is it that these spirits of devils "go forth to the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty?" It is just before the advent. They have been going forth already, and are still going forth: and they shall continue their horrid work of gathering the nations into their great slaughter-house, till the Lord come; for it is added immediately, "Behold, I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments." (Rev. 16: 15.)

5. *Dissociality.*—The coherence of the whole social system is very precarious. Nay, the coherence of its minute component parts, its communities, its neighborhoods, its families, is very slight indeed; if, indeed, it may not be said to be already loosed and dissevered. It is as if our very atmosphere possessed a decomposing power. The cement of society has at length given

way to the corrosive influence of wickedness. Man's native selfishness is in the ascendant. It has burst over its restraints, and is now triumphing. Melancholy triumph for the world! for with it all that is fair and goodly, all that is large-hearted and loving, all that binds us to each other in charity and brotherhood, all that is generous and disinterested, must ere long utterly decay. The world is at length breaking up. Like a stranded vessel over which sea after sea has been driving, it can no longer hold together. Its timbers are parting, and it will soon be a total wreck. God meant the human family to be but one household, knit together in love and brotherhood as well as blood. There has been little enough of this true oneness hitherto; but still there has been some. But now it is disappearing. The family, instead of being like a compact rock, close-knit in all its parts, is fast becoming a mere mound of sand, whose particles have no cohesion, no union, save that of casual, temporary nearness, and whose mass the first springtide will level and sweep away. *Self* is now in full maturity and action. Suspicion of each other is one of the rules of life. It is not possible that the social fabric can cling long together. And who shall *recement* it? Who shall restore the lost unity, and reproduce the vanished confidence? He who comes to make all things new. Things have been allowed to fall into decay, and to continue to crumble down, atom by atom, till he should come, that his should be the glory of remodeling and reconstructing the fallen fabric; and that his might be through eternity the praise, not only of bringing a redeemed Church through death to resurrection-life, and perfection, but of bringing creation through decay and ruin to restitution-life, stability, and comeliness.

6. *Wars and rumors of wars, earthquakes, pestilences, and famines in divers places.*—I need not enter minutely into the proof of the existence of these. The news of every week may bear witness to it. For a while it seemed almost as if the world were at rest, as if its storms had spent themselves. But now all seems changed. Every day brings new indications of disquietude and convulsion. In every region—continent or island, wilderness or fruitful plain—there are wars and rumors of wars, famines, pestilences, earthquakes. Few nations seem willing to draw the sword, yet every nation has her hand upon the hilt; with some it is already gleaming in the air, and with others it is reddened with blood. Over the whole earth is heard "the long, low, distant murmur of dread sound." And is not this the prelude to the last universal war? Is it not a sign of the near approach of him who, when earth's madness and ambition are at their hight—when the summoned nations are gathered at Armageddon, girt for battle and slaughter, himself appears for their discomfiture and ruin? Then, but not till then, wars shall cease, and the weapons of war perish. Then the true Solomon shall begin his reign, hushing the tumults of the nations, and

UMI

introducing the long-expected Sabbath of this weary "work-day world."

7. *The restlessness of the world.*—This sign is in part connected with the preceding, yet may be viewed separately. The state of the world is at present very ominous. "Looking after the things that are coming on the earth" is God's picture of the state of men as the crisis draws on. This certainly seems our attitude at this moment. The earth and the things that are coming on it attract the attention of all. There is something in the state of the world so unsettled, so pregnant with uncertain evil, that every eye is moving to and fro in expectation of strange issues, and as if to catch the first sign of their approach. The form and color of the clouds forebode speedy change, and threaten tempest to the nations. The time for listlessness and apathy is gone. Some thirty years ago, when the skies were bright, and men could promise themselves days of sunshine, it was safe enough to fold the hands and take our ease. But all this is over. No doubt, after the excitement through which we have passed, men would prefer repose. But the onward swell of the waters stays not for an hour. There is among the nations a spirit of restlessness, anarchy, and insubordination; a passionate love of change, a headlong rush to overturn every established system, too furious and united to be ultimately withstood. Many call it but a passing tumult, the frenzy of an hour; but they who understand it know how deep is the spring out of which it flows. The storm, long gathering, but resisted and repressed by the barriers which ancient wisdom had erected for the stability of kingdoms, is concentrating and condensing its strength in these venerable recesses, which may for a while refuse to yield to the explosive force, but which, overstrained at length, give way to the accumulated pressure; the kingdoms of the earth are shivered; throne and temple are overturned; wall and fortress are laid in ruins. Such is the night which is to precede the long-looked-for day, when the whole earth shall arise and put on the garments of beauty, fit and meet for the presence of their glorious King.

8. *Missions.*—No age since that of the apostles has witnessed such wide-spread exertions in behalf of the Jewish and Gentile nations as our own. This, certainly, is a sign peculiar to the present century. I do not defend all that has been done by Missionary and Bible Societies; but still I would point to the fact of hundreds of missionaries going forth to every region of our globe, millions of Bibles circulated, almost every nation having the Scriptures in their own language, and, pointing to these simple but magnificent facts, I ask, Is there not in these a most palpable fulfillment of the words of the Lord, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached to all nations for a witness, and then shall the end come?" In our day we have the universal preaching of the gospel. The result, however, is not the conversion of the world, but the gathering out of the election.

And then "the end" comes! It is not said, and then the millennium comes. But *the end*—the end of the age, the coming of the Son of man. This sign seems also that referred to in Revelation (ch. 14: 6), "I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel, to preach unto them that dwell on the earth." How palpable the sign! It will, I doubt not, become more and more visible—but still, there it is already before us—a sign which foretells a coming Lord, and most distinctly intimates the impossibility of a millennium before his advent.

9. *Disbelief of the approaching advent even in the Church.*—It is no marvel that the world should either deride or deny that event. And it is of the world's mocking that Peter speaks when he says, "There shall come in the last days scoffers, saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" But the Church also loses sight of that day; nay, refuses to credit the news of its approach. She says, "My Lord delayeth his coming." She slumbers and sleeps. And it is just when she is speaking thus, and thus slumbering; it is in an hour when she thinks not, that he arrives. It is often said, Surely, if the time were just at hand, more of God's people would believe it. But it is when many of them are not believing it, and counting on delay, that the Bridegroom comes.

10. *The spread of knowledge.*—Many are running to and fro, and knowledge is increasing. Nor is it knowledge of one kind, but of every kind, secular and sacred. It is, however, for the former that this age is specially distinguished. And Satan is putting forth his utmost resources of power and craft thus to lead men captive at his will. "The prince of all knowledge (as one wrote twenty years ago), where God is not known; of all power, where God is not acknowledged; the bright archangel of the natural man, revealing himself in his angelic glories of natural knowledge, natural beauty, natural wisdom, and natural humanity." Thus does he play his part in this last age! Under these radiant disguises he is bewildering the eyes of men, and persuading them that this diffusion of knowledge is the breaking of the millennial dawn. So specious are his counterfeits, that it is hard to separate the real from the false, the precious from the vile; for when he thus comes forth as an angel of light, clothed in every perfection that the natural heart loves, and the carnal eye admires, who shall penetrate the deception and escape the snare, save those who "know all things," by reason of "the unction from the Holy One?" Most truly (as one has remarked) has the present state of the world been described by one of the world's own poets, when picturing the gay glitter of an evening assembly, over which was thrown

> "A dazzling mass of artificial light,
> Which showed all things, but nothing as they were."

So it is now upon the earth, among the heedless multitudes of

introducing the long-expected Sabbath of this weary "work-day world."

7. *The restlessness of the world.*—This sign is in part connected with the preceding, yet may be viewed separately. The state of the world is at present very ominous. "Looking after the things that are coming on the earth" is God's picture of the state of men as the crisis draws on. This certainly seems our attitude at this moment. The earth and the things that are coming on it attract the attention of all. There is something in the state of the world so unsettled, so pregnant with uncertain evil, that every eye is moving to and fro in expectation of strange issues, and as if to catch the first sign of their approach. The form and color of the clouds forebode speedy change, and threaten tempest to the nations. The time for listlessness and apathy is gone. Some thirty years ago, when the skies were bright, and men could promise themselves days of sunshine, it was safe enough to fold the hands and take our ease. But all this is over. No doubt, after the excitement through which we have passed, men would prefer repose. But the onward swell of the waters stays not for an hour. There is among the nations a spirit of restlessness, anarchy, and insubordination; a passionate love of change, a headlong rush to overturn every established system, too furious and united to be ultimately withstood. Many call it but a passing tumult, the frenzy of an hour; but they who understand it know how deep is the spring out of which it flows. The storm, long gathering, but resisted and repressed by the barriers which ancient wisdom had erected for the stability of kingdoms, is concentrating and condensing its strength in these venerable recesses, which may for a while refuse to yield to the explosive force, but which, overstrained at length, give way to the accumulated pressure; the kingdoms of the earth are shivered; throne and temple are overturned; wall and fortress are laid in ruins. Such is the night which is to precede the long-looked-for day, when the whole earth shall arise and put on the garments of beauty, fit and meet for the presence of their glorious King.

8. *Missions.*—No age since that of the apostles has witnessed such wide-spread exertions in behalf of the Jewish and Gentile nations as our own. This, certainly, is a sign peculiar to the present century. I do not defend all that has been done by Missionary and Bible Societies; but still I would point to the fact of hundreds of missionaries going forth to every region of our globe, millions of Bibles circulated, almost every nation having the Scriptures in their own language, and, pointing to these simple but magnificent facts, I ask, Is there not in these a most palpable fulfillment of the words of the Lord, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached to all nations for a witness, and then shall the end come?" In our day we have the universal preaching of the gospel. The result, however, is not the conversion of the world, but the gathering out of the election.

And then "the end" comes! It is not said, and then the millennium comes. But *the end*—the end of the age, the coming of the Son of man. This sign seems also that referred to in Revelation (ch. 14: 6), "I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel, to preach unto them that dwell on the earth." How palpable the sign! It will, I doubt not, become more and more visible—but still, there it is already before us—a sign which foretells a coming Lord, and most distinctly intimates the impossibility of a millennium before his advent.

9. *Disbelief of the approaching advent even in the Church.*—It is no marvel that the world should either deride or deny that event. And it is of the world's mocking that Peter speaks when he says, "There shall come in the last days scoffers, saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" But the Church also loses sight of that day; nay, refuses to credit the news of its approach. She says, "My Lord delayeth his coming." She slumbers and sleeps. And it is just when she is speaking thus, and thus slumbering; it is in an hour when she thinks not, that he arrives. It is often said, Surely, if the time were just at hand, more of God's people would believe it. But it is when many of them are not believing it, and counting on delay, that the Bridegroom comes.

10. *The spread of knowledge.*—Many are running to and fro, and knowledge is increasing. Nor is it knowledge of one kind, but of every kind, secular and sacred. It is, however, for the former that this age is specially distinguished. And Satan is putting forth his utmost resources of power and craft thus to lead men captive at his will. "The prince of all knowledge (as one wrote twenty years ago), where God is not known; of all power, where God is not acknowledged; the bright archangel of the natural man, revealing himself in his angelic glories of natural knowledge, natural beauty, natural wisdom, and natural humanity." Thus does he play his part in this last age! Under these radiant disguises he is bewildering the eyes of men, and persuading them that this diffusion of knowledge is the breaking of the millennial dawn. So specious are his counterfeits, that it is hard to separate the real from the false, the precious from the vile; for when he thus comes forth as an angel of light, clothed in every perfection that the natural heart loves, and the carnal eye admires, who shall penetrate the deception and escape the snare, save those who "know all things," by reason of "the unction from the Holy One?" Most truly (as one has remarked) has the present state of the world been described by one of the world's own poets, when picturing the gay glitter of an evening assembly, over which was thrown

> "A dazzling mass of artificial light,
> Which showed all things, but nothing as they were."

So it is now upon the earth, among the heedless multitudes of

the children of men. It is the world's midnight. They are eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage. Literature, science, art, philosophy, are all their own! Yet there is an artificial coloring, an unreal brightness, over all. There is music, but it is of the syren kind; not the deep melody of old ancestral song. There is eloquence, too, but it is "the words of man's wisdom," not that which speaks for God and "winneth souls." There is fervor, too, but it is the warmth of wild excitement, born in novelty and nursed by perpetual change. There is high thought, too, but it is often of the unhealthful cast, wrought off at the midnight lamp; not the deep musings begot in fellowship with God, and ceaseless converse with that Word which maketh wise the simple.

Along with all this, there is a proud air of independence, like that which said, "Our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?" There is a reckless determination to hold what opinions men please, unchecked and unreproved. And, then, in connection with this, many are loud in maintaining, on the one hand, the harmlessness of error, and on the other, the omnipotence of truth. No doubt, upon unfallen beings, error must fall innocuous, and truth prove itself resistless. But in this fallen world, error cannot be so innocent, nor truth so omnipotent, as some suppose. Were this the native country of truth; were the atmosphere of this world its native air, we might hope to see it spring up in rich and spontaneous luxuriance. But so long as Satan is the god of this world—"the prince of the power of the air"—truth must ever be an alien to the soil. "It bears a bright golden flower, but not in this clime." The sentiment I allude to is one of Satan's most subtle sophistries, by means of which he hopes to succeed in confounding truth and error. "*Magna est veritas et prævalebit*," is the adage of antiquity. I believe it. I know that there is in reserve for truth a glorious triumph in the ages to come, even upon this dark earth; but this shall not be by its own might, but by the Spirit of the Lord. It is not science and philosophy that are to regenerate the world. They are evidences that the predicted time is come when "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." But the "march of intellect" is not the triumph of truth. They are signs of promised day—

> "last in the train of night,
> If better they belong not to the dawn;"

but they are neither the star of morning nor the sun of righteousness. They shall grace the triumph of truth, but not as confederate allies, to whom in part belongs the glory of the victory, but only as captives bound to its chariot wheels. Truth *shall* prevail! but not till he who is TRUTH shall come to lead it on to victory. Then its present obscurity will only enhance its future exaltation. The darkness which now wraps it conceals, but cannot mar it; and, like the face of heaven when the clouds pass

off, which hide, but soil not its spotless azure, it shall emerge unstained.

These are a few of the many "signs of the times." No thoughtful mind will hastily reject them, even though not wholly satisfied; for even though they may appear defective, yet there is much about them that is not improbable; and what if, after all, they should be true? The *facts* to which I have been adverting exist. It becomes us in good earnest to inquire, What do they mean, what do they indicate?

It was the aberrations of one of our exterior planets that gave the first notice to astronomers of the presence of another orb, outside our present planetary region; so it is the strange aberrations, the irregular movements of things around us, that reveal to the well-taught eye of the Church the near approach of that Star which has been so long absent from our system. And as, when the suggestion was given forth to the students of science, many a telescope was forthwith pointed to the quarter where the predicted stranger was expected to present itself, so when the signs of the times proclaim so audibly "The Lord is at hand," should not every eye be turning upward to the heavens from which he is to descend in glory, and every heart throbbing at the thought that he shall so soon be here? How many astronomers are now reproaching themselves, because they were so slow to credit the calculations of science, and be the first to catch a glimpse of the expected planet! And how far more truly, more deeply bitter may be our reproaches hereafter, if we turn coldly away from the announcement, "Behold, he cometh!" and find ourselves shut out from the blessedness of the promise, "I will give him the Morning Star!"

It is now more than three thousand years since God gave to his Church one of her gladdest, richest songs by the mouth of Hannah, in the day when her tribulation was at an end, and the desire of her heart had been given. It is a song of vast prophetic fullness—a song as marvelous in compass as it is magnificent in thought:

> "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust,
> He lifteth the beggar from the dunghill,
> To set them among princes,
> And to make them inherit the throne of glory;
> For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's,
> And he hath set the world upon them.
> He will keep the feet of his saints,
> And the wicked shall be silent in darkness,
> For by strength shall no man prevail.
> The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces;
> Out of heaven shall he thunder upon them.
> Jehovah shall judge the ends of the earth;
> He shall give strength unto his King,
> And exalt the horn of his Anointed."

All this, of course, was full of meaning, even in that early

the children of men. It is the world's midnight. They are eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage. Literature, science, art, philosophy, are all their own! Yet there is an artificial coloring, an unreal brightness, over all. There is music, but it is of the syren kind; not the deep melody of old ancestral song. There is eloquence, too, but it is "the words of man's wisdom," not that which speaks for God and "winneth souls." There is fervor, too, but it is the warmth of wild excitement, born in novelty and nursed by perpetual change. There is high thought, too, but it is often of the unhealthful cast, wrought off at the midnight lamp; not the deep musings begot in fellowship with God, and ceaseless converse with that Word which maketh wise the simple.

Along with all this, there is a proud air of independence, like that which said, "Our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?" There is a reckless determination to hold what opinions men please, unchecked and unreproved. And, then, in connection with this, many are loud in maintaining, on the one hand, the harmlessness of error, and on the other, the omnipotence of truth. No doubt, upon unfallen beings, error must fall innocuous, and truth prove itself resistless. But in this fallen world, error cannot be so innocent, nor truth so omnipotent, as some suppose. Were this the native country of truth; were the atmosphere of this world its native air, we might hope to see it spring up in rich and spontaneous luxuriance. But so long as Satan is the god of this world—"the prince of the power of the air"—truth must ever be an alien to the soil. "It bears a bright golden flower, but not in this clime." The sentiment I allude to is one of Satan's most subtle sophistries, by means of which he hopes to succeed in confounding truth and error. "*Magna est veritas et prævalebit*," is the adage of antiquity. I believe it. I know that there is in reserve for truth a glorious triumph in the ages to come, even upon this dark earth; but this shall not be by its own might, but by the Spirit of the Lord. It is not science and philosophy that are to regenerate the world. They are evidences that the predicted time is come when "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." But the "march of intellect" is not the triumph of truth. They are signs of promised day—

> "last in the train of night,
> If better they belong not to the dawn;"

but they are neither the star of morning nor the sun of righteousness. They shall grace the triumph of truth, but not as confederate allies, to whom in part belongs the glory of the victory, but only as captives bound to its chariot wheels. Truth *shall* prevail! but not till he who is TRUTH shall come to lead it on to victory. Then its present obscurity will only enhance its future exaltation. The darkness which now wraps it conceals, but cannot mar it; and, like the face of heaven when the clouds pass

off, which hide, but soil not its spotless azure, it shall emerge unstained.

These are a few of the many "signs of the times." No thoughtful mind will hastily reject them, even though not wholly satisfied; for even though they may appear defective, yet there is much about them that is not improbable; and what if, after all, they should be true? The *facts* to which I have been adverting exist. It becomes us in good earnest to inquire, What do they mean, what do they indicate?

It was the aberrations of one of our exterior planets that gave the first notice to astronomers of the presence of another orb, outside our present planetary region; so it is the strange aberrations, the irregular movements of things around us, that reveal to the well-taught eye of the Church the near approach of that Star which has been so long absent from our system. And as, when the suggestion was given forth to the students of science, many a telescope was forthwith pointed to the quarter where the predicted stranger was expected to present itself, so when the signs of the times proclaim so audibly "The Lord is at hand," should not every eye be turning upward to the heavens from which he is to descend in glory, and every heart throbbing at the thought that he shall so soon be here? How many astronomers are now reproaching themselves, because they were so slow to credit the calculations of science, and be the first to catch a glimpse of the expected planet! And how far more truly, more deeply bitter may be our reproaches hereafter, if we turn coldly away from the announcement, "Behold, he cometh!" and find ourselves shut out from the blessedness of the promise, "I will give him the Morning Star!"

It is now more than three thousand years since God gave to his Church one of her gladdest, richest songs by the mouth of Hannah, in the day when her tribulation was at an end, and the desire of her heart had been given. It is a song of vast prophetic fullness—a song as marvelous in compass as it is magnificent in thought:

> "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust,
> He lifteth the beggar from the dunghill,
> To set them among princes,
> And to make them inherit the throne of glory;
> For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's,
> And he hath set the world upon them.
> He will keep the feet of his saints,
> And the wicked shall be silent in darkness,
> For by strength shall no man prevail.
> The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces;
> Out of heaven shall he thunder upon them.
> Jehovah shall judge the ends of the earth;
> He shall give strength unto his King,
> And exalt the horn of his Anointed."

All this, of course, was full of meaning, even in that early

period in which it was uttered; yet how dim that meaning must have been to those who saw these predicted events only afar off! But like all other prophetic songs, this has gathered fullness as it passed along the ages. Each age has imparted light to it, and dispersed shade after shade. Each generation of the Church has drawn out of it a wider and a profounder meaning. Till now, in this last age, we can take it up and sing it, line after line, with an understanding and an emphasis unknown in earlier days. For the time is at hand, and the projected shadows of the future are becoming every day sharper in their outline, and more intelligible in their motions.

The day is at hand when the poor shall be raised out of the dust, set among princes, and made to inherit the throne of glory; when the Lord shall establish the world upon its pillars, that it may not be moved forever. *Now* he keepeth the feet of his saints, but *then* he shall break their enemies in pieces like a potter's vessel, sending forth his lightnings to scatter them and consign them to the blackness of darkness forever. *Now* the wicked are exalted, but *then* Jehovah shall judge the ends of the earth, giving strength unto his own anointed King, crowning him with the "many crowns," and investing him with glory and dominion forever. What a spectacle shall the new earth then present, when delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God! Once more meet for God to look upon, and worthy to be the dwelling-place of his eternal Son! Once more linked to heaven by the true ladder of which Jacob saw but the symbol; angels of God ascending and descending, in blessed fellowship and ministries of love! Once more fit to take rank in creation, not, as hitherto, an outcast planet doomed to darkness, but radiant all over with holy beauty, the seat of government and center of influence to the unmeasured universe around.

And how soon shall present night be forgotten in the brightness of the endless day! How soon shall the curse give place to the blessing, barrenness be exchanged for fruitfulness, and all pollution be swept clean away! It is but "a little while" and all shall be well! Another night's tossing on the billows, and then the calm of the eternal morn! One more outburst of the "warring winds," and then all storms are hushed, and the long dissonances of time melt into the one harmony of creation's boundless song!

EDITORIAL.

In presenting THE ADVENT-CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY to our patrons, and the public, we may with propriety quote from our published prospectus concerning its design and objects:

The design of this publication is to promote the evolution of truth upon all Bible doctrine; but more especially the following points: Prophecy, fulfilled, fulfilling, and unfulfilled; The second advent of Christ, personal, and at hand; The objects of his advent; His future kingdom, and its inhabitants; The home of the future life; Man: his nature; The intermediate state; Immortality and eternal life—how obtained; The future of the wicked, and related subjects.

The objects of THE QUARTERLY will be, (1) To defend the positions taken on the above topics by the body known as Advent-Christians. (2) To expose the unscriptural position of our opponents, the errors of Immaterialism, and the absurdities of the mystic and spiritualizing systems of interpretation. (3) To furnish reliable expositions of Bible doctrine from the pens of the best writers, among our own and other denominations, upon the subjects indicated.

It is not necessary for us to enlarge on these points. We only ask the prayers of all interested that we may so carry out the purposes indicated as to best subserve the cause of Bible truth, and merit the approbation of that Being without whose approval all other commendation would be worthless.

THE opening article of our first number is, very appropriately, from the pen of Eld. Joshua V. Himes, the first publisher of an Advent periodical in this country. When in 1839 William Miller was about to quit the field as a lecturer upon prophecy, quite discouraged, if not disheartened, he providentially made the acquaintance of Eld. Himes, who, after hearing and examining his views, became convinced that they were in the main, at least, correct; and with faith in their truth came also the conviction that they should be published more widely than they could be simply by one traveling preacher and his book. Conviction was speedily followed by action. Conferences were called, periodicals established, books and tracts multiplied, and the Advent movement was fairly inaugurated.

It is not our purpose to here sketch the principles or progress of Adventism. We simply remark, that as a leader in this movement Eld. Himes has met the fate of all leaders, in having his motives assailed and his actions misconstrued. Especially has this been the case in respect to his relations to the so-called Life and Death question. But he has left cavilers without an excuse by his frank and interesting exposition of his experience on the Life and Death question. While many of his coadjutors have become conservative, he has been growing more radical with age.

period in which it was uttered; yet how dim that meaning must have been to those who saw these predicted events only afar off! But like all other prophetic songs, this has gathered fullness as it passed along the ages. Each age has imparted light to it, and dispersed shade after shade. Each generation of the Church has drawn out of it a wider and a profounder meaning. Till now, in this last age, we can take it up and sing it, line after line, with an understanding and an emphasis unknown in earlier days. For the time is at hand, and the projected shadows of the future are becoming every day sharper in their outline, and more intelligible in their motions.

The day is at hand when the poor shall be raised out of the dust, set among princes, and made to inherit the throne of glory; when the Lord shall establish the world upon its pillars, that it may not be moved forever. *Now* he keepeth the feet of his saints, but *then* he shall break their enemies in pieces like a potter's vessel, sending forth his lightnings to scatter them and consign them to the blackness of darkness forever. *Now* the wicked are exalted, but *then* Jehovah shall judge the ends of the earth, giving strength unto his own anointed King, crowning him with the "many crowns," and investing him with glory and dominion forever. What a spectacle shall the new earth then present, when delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God! Once more meet for God to look upon, and worthy to be the dwelling-place of his eternal Son! Once more linked to heaven by the true ladder of which Jacob saw but the symbol; angels of God ascending and descending, in blessed fellowship and ministries of love! Once more fit to take rank in creation, not, as hitherto, an outcast planet doomed to darkness, but radiant all over with holy beauty, the seat of government and center of influence to the unmeasured universe around.

And how soon shall present night be forgotten in the brightness of the endless day! How soon shall the curse give place to the blessing, barrenness be exchanged for fruitfulness, and all pollution be swept clean away! It is but "a little while" and all shall be well! Another night's tossing on the billows, and then the calm of the eternal morn! One more outburst of the "warring winds," and then all storms are hushed, and the long dissonances of time melt into the one harmony of creation's boundless song!

EDITORIAL.

In presenting THE ADVENT-CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY to our patrons, and the public, we may with propriety quote from our published prospectus concerning its design and objects:

The design of this publication is to promote the evolution of truth upon all Bible doctrine; but more especially the following points: Prophecy, fulfilled, fulfilling, and unfulfilled; The second advent of Christ, personal, and at hand; The objects of his advent; His future kingdom, and its inhabitants; The home of the future life; Man: his nature; The intermediate state; Immortality and eternal life—how obtained; The future of the wicked, and related subjects.

The objects of THE QUARTERLY will be, (1) To defend the positions taken on the above topics by the body known as Advent-Christians. (2) To expose the unscriptural position of our opponents, the errors of Immaterialism, and the absurdities of the mystic and spiritualizing systems of interpretation. (3) To furnish reliable expositions of Bible doctrine from the pens of the best writers, among our own and other denominations, upon the subjects indicated.

It is not necessary for us to enlarge on these points. We only ask the prayers of all interested that we may so carry out the purposes indicated as to best subserve the cause of Bible truth, and merit the approbation of that Being without whose approval all other commendation would be worthless.

THE opening article of our first number is, very appropriately, from the pen of Eld. Joshua V. Himes, the first publisher of an Advent periodical in this country. When in 1839 William Miller was about to quit the field as a lecturer upon prophecy, quite discouraged, if not disheartened, he providentially made the acquaintance of Eld. Himes, who, after hearing and examining his views, became convinced that they were in the main, at least, correct; and with faith in their truth came also the conviction that they should be published more widely than they could be simply by one traveling preacher and his book. Conviction was speedily followed by action. Conferences were called, periodicals established, books and tracts multiplied, and the Advent movement was fairly inaugurated.

It is not our purpose to here sketch the principles or progress of Adventism. We simply remark, that as a leader in this movement Eld. Himes has met the fate of all leaders, in having his motives assailed and his actions misconstrued. Especially has this been the case in respect to his relations to the so-called Life and Death question. But he has left cavilers without an excuse by his frank and interesting exposition of his experience on the Life and Death question. While many of his coadjutors have become conservative, he has been growing more radical with age.

Truth and Love is from the pen of a London clergyman, the Rev. Samuel Minton. Mr. Minton has brought upon himself no little persecution by his trenchant preaching and writing against the dogmas of the immortality of the soul and the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. We have more excellent articles from his pen for our readers.

Churchianity vs. Christianity is the apt title of a searching though fair criticism of popular religion by Eld. A. A. Phelps, of Rochester, N. Y. Eld. Phelps was formerly connected with the body called Free Methodists—a misnomer; no body of Methodists is more sectarian—who withdrew their fellowship on his profession of belief in the extinction of evil. Our readers will second our request for Eld. Phelps to become a frequent contributor to our pages.

In his masterly examination of *Paul's "Desire to Depart,"* Br. Thomas Davidson, of Quebec, P. Q., clears away the fog with which immaterialism has beclouded Pauline theology, and relieves the Apostle of the imputations of inconsistency in teaching to which the popular immaterialist view renders him liable.

Eld. L. C. Collins, of Monticello, Minn., in an article on *The Kingdom of God*, gives new interest to an old subject. There is a peculiar charm in his style which ever gives a new zest to "old truths."

Eld. Collins is a contribution to the Advent cause from the Methodist Episcopal Church, for which we heartily thank them. He was expelled from the Minnesota Conference because of his belief that the finally impenitent will literally perish, or become extinct at the judgment. He was thus forced to speak out upon the views which previously had been almost, or quite, a private opinion. Some ten thousand of his tracts, *Address to the Minnesota Conference* and *Objections Removed*, have been circulated. Our hope is that the M. E. Church will ever be zealous in expelling *such* heretics.

Life and Death is the Scriptural title of an able contribution from the pen of James H. Whitmore, of Ypsilanti, Mich. The article is a chapter from a forthcoming work, to be issued by the W. A. C. P. Association during the coming fall. The most careless reader will observe the clearness and force of Mr. Whitmore's reasoning, his powers of analysis, and his fairness in the presentation and consideration of objections. His work will be one of the most valuable contributions yet made to Advent-Christian literature, and will command the attention and respect of our most bigoted opponents.

The selection on *The Signs of the Times* is from the writings of the Rev. Horatius Bonar, editor of *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*. It is the able utterance of candid yet thoroughly earnest conviction.

We are very grateful for the kind reception our proposition for an Advent quarterly magazine has met with; and are happy to assure our readers that by prompt subscriptions, all doubt of its continued existence is removed. It is settled that The Quarterly is to be a permanent addition to Advent literature. We are anxious however to introduce some improvements; and chiefly we desire to make an addition of twenty pages in the second number, giving one hundred pages of reading matter instead of

eighty. The requisite to this desired end is *an enlarged subscription list*. Let every subscriber procure another, and the improvements, including the enlargement, will be secured. Who will help?

The Editor will in no case be responsible for the sentiments of correspondents. We have no desire to make The Quarterly merely a reflex of our own personal ideas and opinions, as must be the case if we assume the responsibility of the sentiment of all we publish. We shall aim to present articles from able and judicious minds, and the mere fact that they may differ in opinion with us, or others, does not prove them wrong, or unworthy of a hearing. Differences of opinion lead to investigation; and to stimulate investigation is one great object of The Quarterly. Not that we intend to make it an organ for the introduction of schism and distraction. We think we understand the distinction between *liberty* and *license*. The former means life and healthful growth in the body. The latter means divisions and death.

Let every number of The Quarterly be made useful. Keep it in sight. Let it lie on your table so exposed that visitors will see it. If they become interested, lend it to them, urging them to read it, and to return it promptly, that others may have the same opportunity. Don't allow it to be lost, or destroyed, or be laid away out of sight to serve as a dust accumulator; let it preach somewhere, if it is only by keeping it in sight.

One of the most interesting documents issued of late on the question of the duration of evil is an article from the pen of Dr. Charles K. True, of Massachusetts, which appeared in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1869. The article is a brief review of Charles Beecher's theodicy, as set forth in his work, *Redeemer and Redeemed*. He gives a concise, fair, and exceedingly interesting statement of Mr. Beecher's position, and then indulges in some intimations of his own views of this question, which if a past precedent be carried out indicate another expulsion for "heresy" from the Methodist Church. Certainly Eld. Collins' "heresy" was not more clearly defined than is Dr. True's in this article. The Doctor's remarks on *punishment* are so just and forcible, and his statement of the various theodicies now claiming attention are so clear, that we quote them for the consideration of our readers:

"It remains to consider the nature of the penalty which is attached to sin in the law. Theologians seem not to be conscious that it is here the real difficulty lies in the vindication of the Divine government. We can reconcile with our ideas of the justice and goodness of God the origin of sin, the depravity of our fallen race, and the atonement, on the supposition that accountable beings are not, in the trial of their virtue, put to the risk of too great consequences in case of failure. The plea that they are free, and if they know their doom, whatever it may be, they are to blame for incurring it, is not satisfactory. They should not be allowed to take such responsibility. Besides, the guilty are not the only ones affected by their doom; their friends, the angels of God, all sympathetic creatures, and God himself, are concerned in

Truth and Love is from the pen of a London clergyman, the Rev. Samuel Minton. Mr. Minton has brought upon himself no little persecution by his trenchant preaching and writing against the dogmas of the immortality of the soul and the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. We have more excellent articles from his pen for our readers.

Churchianity vs. Christianity is the apt title of a searching though fair criticism of popular religion by Eld. A. A. Phelps, of Rochester, N. Y. Eld. Phelps was formerly connected with the body called Free Methodists—a misnomer; no body of Methodists is more sectarian—who withdrew their fellowship on his profession of belief in the extinction of evil. Our readers will second our request for Eld. Phelps to become a frequent contributor to our pages.

In his masterly examination of *Paul's "Desire to Depart,"* Br. Thomas Davidson, of Quebec, P. Q., clears away the fog with which immaterialism has beclouded Pauline theology, and relieves the Apostle of the imputations of inconsistency in teaching to which the popular immaterialist view renders him liable.

Eld. L. C. Collins, of Monticello, Minn., in an article on *The Kingdom of God*, gives new interest to an old subject. There is a peculiar charm in his style which ever gives a new zest to "old truths."

Eld. Collins is a contribution to the Advent cause from the Methodist Episcopal Church, for which we heartily thank them. He was expelled from the Minnesota Conference because of his belief that the finally impenitent will literally perish, or become extinct at the judgment. He was thus forced to speak out upon the views which previously had been almost, or quite, a private opinion. Some ten thousand of his tracts, *Address to the Minnesota Conference* and *Objections Removed*, have been circulated. Our hope is that the M. E. Church will ever be zealous in expelling *such* heretics.

Life and Death is the Scriptural title of an able contribution from the pen of James H. Whitmore, of Ypsilanti, Mich. The article is a chapter from a forthcoming work, to be issued by the W. A. C. P. Association during the coming fall. The most careless reader will observe the clearness and force of Mr. Whitmore's reasoning, his powers of analysis, and his fairness in the presentation and consideration of objections. His work will be one of the most valuable contributions yet made to Advent-Christian literature, and will command the attention and respect of our most bigoted opponents.

The selection on *The Signs of the Times* is from the writings of the Rev. Horatius Bonar, editor of *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*. It is the able utterance of candid yet thoroughly earnest conviction.

We are very grateful for the kind reception our proposition for an Advent quarterly magazine has met with; and are happy to assure our readers that by prompt subscriptions, all doubt of its continued existence is removed. It is settled that The Quarterly is to be a permanent addition to Advent literature. We are anxious however to introduce some improvements; and chiefly we desire to make an addition of twenty pages in the second number, giving one hundred pages of reading matter instead of

eighty. The requisite to this desired end is *an enlarged subscription list*. Let every subscriber procure another, and the improvements, including the enlargement, will be secured. Who will help?

The Editor will in no case be responsible for the sentiments of correspondents. We have no desire to make The Quarterly merely a reflex of our own personal ideas and opinions, as must be the case if we assume the responsibility of the sentiment of all we publish. We shall aim to present articles from able and judicious minds, and the mere fact that they may differ in opinion with us, or others, does not prove them wrong, or unworthy of a hearing. Differences of opinion lead to investigation; and to stimulate investigation is one great object of The Quarterly. Not that we intend to make it an organ for the introduction of schism and distraction. We think we understand the distinction between *liberty* and *license*. The former means life and healthful growth in the body. The latter means divisions and death.

Let every number of The Quarterly be made useful. Keep it in sight. Let it lie on your table so exposed that visitors will see it. If they become interested, lend it to them, urging them to read it, and to return it promptly, that others may have the same opportunity. Don't allow it to be lost, or destroyed, or be laid away out of sight to serve as a dust accumulator; let it preach somewhere, if it is only by keeping it in sight.

One of the most interesting documents issued of late on the question of the duration of evil is an article from the pen of Dr. Charles K. True, of Massachusetts, which appeared in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1869. The article is a brief review of Charles Beecher's theodicy, as set forth in his work, *Redeemer and Redeemed*. He gives a concise, fair, and exceedingly interesting statement of Mr. Beecher's position, and then indulges in some intimations of his own views of this question, which if a past precedent be carried out indicate another expulsion for "heresy" from the Methodist Church. Certainly Eld. Collins' "heresy" was not more clearly defined than is Dr. True's in this article. The Doctor's remarks on *punishment* are so just and forcible, and his statement of the various theodicies now claiming attention are so clear, that we quote them for the consideration of our readers:

"It remains to consider the nature of the penalty which is attached to sin in the law. Theologians seem not to be conscious that it is here the real difficulty lies in the vindication of the Divine government. We can reconcile with our ideas of the justice and goodness of God the origin of sin, the depravity of our fallen race, and the atonement, on the supposition that accountable beings are not, in the trial of their virtue, put to the risk of too great consequences in case of failure. The plea that they are free, and if they know their doom, whatever it may be, they are to blame for incurring it, is not satisfactory. They should not be allowed to take such responsibility. Besides, the guilty are not the only ones affected by their doom; their friends, the angels of God, all sympathetic creatures, and God himself, are concerned in

Truth and Love is from the pen of a London clergyman, the Rev. Samuel Minton. Mr. Minton has brought upon himself no little persecution by his trenchant preaching and writing against the dogmas of the immortality of the soul and the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. We have more excellent articles from his pen for our readers.

Churchianity vs. Christianity is the apt title of a searching though fair criticism of popular religion by Eld. A. A. Phelps, of Rochester, N. Y. Eld. Phelps was formerly connected with the body called Free Methodists—a misnomer; no body of Methodists is more sectarian—who withdrew their fellowship on his profession of belief in the extinction of evil. Our readers will second our request for Eld. Phelps to become a frequent contributor to our pages.

In his masterly examination of *Paul's "Desire to Depart,"* Br. Thomas Davidson, of Quebec, P. Q., clears away the fog with which immaterialism has beclouded Pauline theology, and relieves the Apostle of the imputations of inconsistency in teaching to which the popular immaterialist view renders him liable.

Eld. L. C. Collins, of Monticello, Minn., in an article on *The Kingdom of God*, gives new interest to an old subject. There is a peculiar charm in his style which ever gives a new zest to "old truths."

Eld. Collins is a contribution to the Advent cause from the Methodist Episcopal Church, for which we heartily thank them. He was expelled from the Minnesota Conference because of his belief that the finally impenitent will literally perish, or become extinct at the judgment. He was thus forced to speak out upon the views which previously had been almost, or quite, a private opinion. Some ten thousand of his tracts, *Address to the Minnesota Conference* and *Objections Removed*, have been circulated. Our hope is that the M. E. Church will ever be zealous in expelling *such* heretics.

Life and Death is the Scriptural title of an able contribution from the pen of James H. Whitmore, of Ypsilanti, Mich. The article is a chapter from a forthcoming work, to be issued by the W. A. C. P. Association during the coming fall. The most careless reader will observe the clearness and force of Mr. Whitmore's reasoning, his powers of analysis, and his fairness in the presentation and consideration of objections. His work will be one of the most valuable contributions yet made to Advent-Christian literature, and will command the attention and respect of our most bigoted opponents.

The selection on *The Signs of the Times* is from the writings of the Rev. Horatius Bonar, editor of *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*. It is the able utterance of candid yet thoroughly earnest conviction.

We are very grateful for the kind reception our proposition for an Advent quarterly magazine has met with; and are happy to assure our readers that by prompt subscriptions, all doubt of its continued existence is removed. It is settled that The Quarterly is to be a permanent addition to Advent literature. We are anxious however to introduce some improvements; and chiefly we desire to make an addition of twenty pages in the second number, giving one hundred pages of reading matter instead of

eighty. The requisite to this desired end is *an enlarged subscription list.* Let every subscriber procure another, and the improvements, including the enlargement, will be secured. Who will help?

The Editor will in no case be responsible for the sentiments of correspondents. We have no desire to make The Quarterly merely a reflex of our own personal ideas and opinions, as must be the case if we assume the responsibility of the sentiment of all we publish. We shall aim to present articles from able and judicious minds, and the mere fact that they may differ in opinion with us, or others, does not prove them wrong, or unworthy of a hearing. Differences of opinion lead to investigation; and to stimulate investigation is one great object of The Quarterly. Not that we intend to make it an organ for the introduction of schism and distraction. We think we understand the distinction between *liberty* and *license*. The former means life and healthful growth in the body. The latter means divisions and death.

Let every number of The Quarterly be made useful. Keep it in sight. Let it lie on your table so exposed that visitors will see it. If they become interested, lend it to them, urging them to read it, and to return it promptly, that others may have the same opportunity. Don't allow it to be lost, or destroyed, or be laid away out of sight to serve as a dust accumulator; let it preach somewhere, if it is only by keeping it in sight.

One of the most interesting documents issued of late on the question of the duration of evil is an article from the pen of Dr. Charles K. True, of Massachusetts, which appeared in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1869. The article is a brief review of Charles Beecher's theodicy, as set forth in his work, *Redeemer and Redeemed*. He gives a concise, fair, and exceedingly interesting statement of Mr. Beecher's position, and then indulges in some intimations of his own views of this question, which if a past precedent be carried out indicate another expulsion for "heresy" from the Methodist Church. Certainly Eld. Collins' "heresy" was not more clearly defined than is Dr. True's in this article. The Doctor's remarks on *punishment* are so just and forcible, and his statement of the various theodicies now claiming attention are so clear, that we quote them for the consideration of our readers:

"It remains to consider the nature of the penalty which is attached to sin in the law. Theologians seem not to be conscious that it is here the real difficulty lies in the vindication of the Divine government. We can reconcile with our ideas of the justice and goodness of God the origin of sin, the depravity of our fallen race, and the atonement, on the supposition that accountable beings are not, in the trial of their virtue, put to the risk of too great consequences in case of failure. The plea that they are free, and if they know their doom, whatever it may be, they are to blame for incurring it, is not satisfactory. They should not be allowed to take such responsibility. Besides, the guilty are not the only ones affected by their doom; their friends, the angels of God, all sympathetic creatures, and God himself, are concerned in.

Truth and Love is from the pen of a London clergyman, the Rev. Samuel Minton. Mr. Minton has brought upon himself no little persecution by his trenchant preaching and writing against the dogmas of the immortality of the soul and the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. We have more excellent articles from his pen for our readers.

Churchianity vs. Christianity is the apt title of a searching though fair criticism of popular religion by Eld. A. A. Phelps, of Rochester, N. Y. Eld. Phelps was formerly connected with the body called Free Methodists—a misnomer; no body of Methodists is more sectarian—who withdrew their fellowship on his profession of belief in the extinction of evil. Our readers will second our request for Eld. Phelps to become a frequent contributor to our pages.

In his masterly examination of *Paul's "Desire to Depart,"* Br. Thomas Davidson, of Quebec, P. Q., clears away the fog with which immaterialism has beclouded Pauline theology, and relieves the Apostle of the imputations of inconsistency in teaching to which the popular immaterialist view renders him liable.

Eld. L. C. Collins, of Monticello, Minn., in an article on *The Kingdom of God*, gives new interest to an old subject. There is a peculiar charm in his style which ever gives a new zest to "old truths."

Eld. Collins is a contribution to the Advent cause from the Methodist Episcopal Church, for which we heartily thank them. He was expelled from the Minnesota Conference because of his belief that the finally impenitent will literally perish, or become extinct at the judgment. He was thus forced to speak out upon the views which previously had been almost, or quite, a private opinion. Some ten thousand of his tracts, *Address to the Minnesota Conference* and *Objections Removed*, have been circulated. Our hope is that the M. E. Church will ever be zealous in expelling *such* heretics.

Life and Death is the Scriptural title of an able contribution from the pen of James H. Whitmore, of Ypsilanti, Mich. The article is a chapter from a forthcoming work, to be issued by the W. A. C. P. Association during the coming fall. The most careless reader will observe the clearness and force of Mr. Whitmore's reasoning, his powers of analysis, and his fairness in the presentation and consideration of objections. His work will be one of the most valuable contributions yet made to Advent-Christian literature, and will command the attention and respect of our most bigoted opponents.

The selection on *The Signs of the Times* is from the writings of the Rev. Horatius Bonar, editor of *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*. It is the able utterance of candid yet thoroughly earnest conviction.

We are very grateful for the kind reception our proposition for an Advent quarterly magazine has met with; and are happy to assure our readers that by prompt subscriptions, all doubt of its continued existence is removed. It is settled that The Quarterly is to be a permanent addition to Advent literature. We are anxious however to introduce some improvements; and chiefly we desire to make an addition of twenty pages in the second number, giving one hundred pages of reading matter instead of

eighty. The requisite to this desired end is *an enlarged subscription list.* Let every subscriber procure another, and the improvements, including the enlargement, will be secured. Who will help?

The Editor will in no case be responsible for the sentiments of correspondents. We have no desire to make The Quarterly merely a reflex of our own personal ideas and opinions, as must be the case if we assume the responsibility of the sentiment of all we publish. We shall aim to present articles from able and judicious minds, and the mere fact that they may differ in opinion with us, or others, does not prove them wrong, or unworthy of a hearing. Differences of opinion lead to investigation; and to stimulate investigation is one great object of The Quarterly. Not that we intend to make it an organ for the introduction of schism and distraction. We think we understand the distinction between *liberty* and *license*. The former means life and healthful growth in the body. The latter means divisions and death.

Let every number of The Quarterly be made useful. Keep it in sight. Let it lie on your table so exposed that visitors will see it. If they become interested, lend it to them, urging them to read it, and to return it promptly, that others may have the same opportunity. Don't allow it to be lost, or destroyed, or be laid away out of sight to serve as a dust accumulator; let it preach somewhere, if it is only by keeping it in sight.

One of the most interesting documents issued of late on the question of the duration of evil is an article from the pen of Dr. Charles K. True, of Massachusetts, which appeared in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1869. The article is a brief review of Charles Beecher's theodicy, as set forth in his work, *Redeemer and Redeemed*. He gives a concise, fair, and exceedingly interesting statement of Mr. Beecher's position, and then indulges in some intimations of his own views of this question, which if a past precedent be carried out indicate another expulsion for "heresy" from the Methodist Church. Certainly Eld. Collins' "heresy" was not more clearly defined than is Dr. True's in this article. The Doctor's remarks on *punishment* are so just and forcible, and his statement of the various theodicies now claiming attention are so clear, that we quote them for the consideration of our readers:

"It remains to consider the nature of the penalty which is attached to sin in the law. Theologians seem not to be conscious that it is here the real difficulty lies in the vindication of the Divine government. We can reconcile with our ideas of the justice and goodness of God the origin of sin, the depravity of our fallen race, and the atonement, on the supposition that accountable beings are not, in the trial of their virtue, put to the risk of too great consequences in case of failure. The plea that they are free, and if they know their doom, whatever it may be, they are to blame for incurring it, is not satisfactory. They should not be allowed to take such responsibility. Besides, the guilty are not the only ones affected by their doom; their friends, the angels of God, all sympathetic creatures, and God himself, are concerned in.

their sufferings. Yet on this superficial plea theologians have, to alarm the wicked, piled up horror upon horror, lasting unrespited through eternal ages, not considering in what an odious light it places the character of the Creator, nor whether such exaggerations are not likely to stagger all faith in revelation. Indeed, most of the infidelity of Christendom can be traced to the revulsion which kind and considerate minds have experienced on this subject. It is time for the Christian world to wake up to the effect of such dogmas if they would not have evangelical religion completely wrecked upon these sand-bars. It is not our purpose to define the scriptural doctrine of future punishment; perhaps in its nature, if not in its duration, it is left in obscurity and mystery. Our point is, that it behooves us not to accept any doctrine which reflects upon the Divine justice and goodness. This is indeed the very first principle of correct interpretation. The following schemes for eternal punishment are now pressed upon our attention:

"1. Mr. Beecher's view of the doom of sinners is, that it depends for its continuance upon the continued impenitence of the condemned. At any moment when they will submit to God and ask for mercy they will receive it; but then he believes that they never will submit. This is the view taken by the author of *Ecce Deus* (and by Bledsoe in his *Theodicy*), who displays equal ability with our author in treating of this perplexing topic, subject, however, to one drawback in respect to his absurd and almost blasphemous remarks upon the impossibility of the Almighty's annihilating moral beings.

"2. There is the doctrine of Dr. Bushnell, that sinners receive a certain measure of sorrow at their doom; but their being may grow less and less without ever reaching a complete extinction, as the asymptote of a circle is a line so projected as to be always approaching the circle without ever touching it.

"3. The doctrine that the penalty-state is exile from heaven forever, in a depraved character and under eternal despair of any improvement, but not increasing in sin or in misery by any proclivity derived from a state of probation, but subject to such alternations as may arise from keeping or breaking the rules of prison discipline.

"4. The opinion that by the law of habit sinners will grow more and more wicked, and consequently more and more miserable forever.

"5. The doctrine that in addition to the pangs of a guilty conscience and disappointment of heaven the wicked will be positively and ceaselessly tormented by burning unconsumed in actual fire, or its equivalent in the power to torture.

"6. The doctrine that fire is but the symbol of swift and painful destruction, and that the eternal doom of the wicked is literal death at the day of judgment; that is, the extinction of consciousness and all capacity of thinking, or feeling, or acting. This ends, of course, the terrible scene of sin and suffering by the destruction of the subject.

"7. The human soul is material or inseparable from the body—and perishes with the body at death; a destiny which will be reversed only in the case of the righteous by resurrection at the final coming of Christ.

"8. The resurrection of the wicked at the last day to receive a public judgment and the doom of utter annihilation.

"9. Transformation, or moral death, by the elimination of the moral attributes of wicked men and the oblivion of memory; the abuse of man's moral capacity ending in its destruction, and degrading him, like Nebuchadnezzar, to the level of the beasts of the field.

"All these theories agree as to the eternal loss of heaven as being the main element in the doom of the lost. To the inquiring mind, reconsidering the question *de novo*, the problem would be to determine which theory is most agreeable to the Scriptures and to rational considerations, and especially the justice and wisdom of God and the moral order and peace of the universe. With some of them a rational vindication of the divine government is easy; but with others no theodicy is possible, whatever views may be taken of the origin of sin, of depravity, and probation."

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—OCTOBER, 1869.—NO. II.

THE COMFORTING HOPE.

BY ELD. O. R. FASSETT, Minneapolis, Minn.

"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." (1 Thess. 4: 13, 14.)

"There is upon many of us a fear of death, and yet surely we may not be afraid of sleep. Never more will these sleepers lift tired hands, and wipe away hot tears. Night is the time for rest; and that unbroken sleep—how much it will do for the bodies which are sown corruptible, and reaped in incorruption."—*Mary Anne Farningham.*

"Tired nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep."
* * * * * * * * *
"Yet that were vain, if dreams infest the grave."—*Young.*

The Gospel affords comforting and consoling hope to Christian believers, when bereaved of their near and dear Christian friends, or kindred, who have "fallen asleep in Jesus." And the Apostle would not have believers "*ignorant*" of the comforting "*hope*," amid the sorrows of the present, their own mortality, and that of those who have thus fallen under the dominion of the grave.

The resurrection from the dead of our Lord and Redeemer forms the sure foundation and basis of "that blessed hope" "concerning them which are asleep."

"As Jesus died and rose again
Victorious from the dead;
So his disciples rise and reign
With their triumphant Head."

A careful analysis of the text, and especially of the explana-

their sufferings. Yet on this superficial plea theologians have, to alarm the wicked, piled up horror upon horror, lasting unrespited through eternal ages, not considering in what an odious light it places the character of the Creator, nor whether such exaggerations are not likely to stagger all faith in revelation. Indeed, most of the infidelity of Christendom can be traced to the revulsion which kind and considerate minds have experienced on this subject. It is time for the Christian world to wake up to the effect of such dogmas if they would not have evangelical religion completely wrecked upon these sand-bars. It is not our purpose to define the scriptural doctrine of future punishment; perhaps in its nature, if not in its duration, it is left in obscurity and mystery. Our point is, that it behooves us not to accept any doctrine which reflects upon the Divine justice and goodness. This is indeed the very first principle of correct interpretation. The following schemes for eternal punishment are now pressed upon our attention:

"1. Mr. Beecher's view of the doom of sinners is, that it depends for its continuance upon the continued impenitence of the condemned. At any moment when they will submit to God and ask for mercy they will receive it; but then he believes that they never will submit. This is the view taken by the author of *Ecce Deus* (and by Bledsoe in his *Theodicy*), who displays equal ability with our author in treating of this perplexing topic, subject, however, to one drawback in respect to his absurd and almost blasphemous remarks upon the impossibility of the Almighty's annihilating moral beings.

"2. There is the doctrine of Dr. Bushnell, that sinners receive a certain measure of sorrow at their doom; but their being may grow less and less without ever reaching a complete extinction, as the asymptote of a circle is a line so projected as to be always approaching the circle without ever touching it.

"3. The doctrine that the penalty-state is exile from heaven forever, in a depraved character and under eternal despair of any improvement, but not increasing in sin or in misery by any proclivity derived from a state of probation, but subject to such alternations as may arise from keeping or breaking the rules of prison discipline.

"4. The opinion that by the law of habit sinners will grow more and more wicked, and consequently more and more miserable forever.

"5. The doctrine that in addition to the pangs of a guilty conscience and disappointment of heaven the wicked will be positively and ceaselessly tormented by burning unconsumed in actual fire, or its equivalent in the power to torture.

"6. The doctrine that fire is but the symbol of swift and painful destruction, and that the eternal doom of the wicked is literal death at the day of judgment; that is, the extinction of consciousness and all capacity of thinking, or feeling, or acting. This ends, of course, the terrible scene of sin and suffering by the destruction of the subject.

"7. The human soul is material or inseparable from the body—and perishes with the body at death; a destiny which will be reversed only in the case of the righteous by resurrection at the final coming of Christ.

"8. The resurrection of the wicked at the last day to receive a public judgment and the doom of utter annihilation.

"9. Transformation, or moral death, by the elimination of the moral attributes of wicked men and the oblivion of memory; the abuse of man's moral capacity ending in its destruction, and degrading him, like Nebuchadnezzar, to the level of the beasts of the field.

"All these theories agree as to the eternal loss of heaven as being the main element in the doom of the lost. To the inquiring mind, reconsidering the question *de novo*, the problem would be to determine which theory is most agreeable to the Scriptures and to rational considerations, and especially the justice and wisdom of God and the moral order and peace of the universe. With some of them a rational vindication of the divine government is easy; but with others no theodicy is possible, whatever views may be taken of the origin of sin, of depravity, and probation."

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—OCTOBER, 1869.—NO. II.

THE COMFORTING HOPE.

BY ELD. O. R. FASSETT, Minneapolis, Minn.

"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." (1 Thess. 4: 13, 14.)

"There is upon many of us a fear of death, and yet surely we may not be afraid of sleep. Never more will these sleepers lift tired hands, and wipe away hot tears. Night is the time for rest; and that unbroken sleep—how much it will do for the bodies which are sown corruptible, and reaped in incorruption."—*Mary Anne Farningham.*

"Tired nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep."
* * * * * * * * *
"Yet that were vain, if dreams infest the grave."—*Young.*

The Gospel affords comforting and consoling hope to Christian believers, when bereaved of their near and dear Christian friends, or kindred, who have "fallen asleep in Jesus." And the Apostle would not have believers "*ignorant*" of the comforting "*hope*," amid the sorrows of the present, their own mortality, and that of those who have thus fallen under the dominion of the grave.

The resurrection from the dead of our Lord and Redeemer forms the sure foundation and basis of "that blessed hope" "concerning them which are asleep."

"As Jesus died and rose again
Victorious from the dead;
So his disciples rise and reign
With their triumphant Head."

A careful analysis of the text, and especially of the explana-

tory passage (v. 14), is necessary to a right apprehension of the gospel hope.

"*Will God bring with him.*" The Apostle explains this sentence in his other epistles. He says: "The God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus," etc. (Heb. 13: 20.) And again: "Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up *us* also *by* Jesus." (2 Cor. 4: 14.) We therefore conclude with him: "Even so, them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring ["again from the dead," as he "brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus"] *with him*," or "*by Jesus.*" Hence he proceeds to affirm: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." (v. 16–18.) Thus the Apostle makes plain [1] from *whence* he will "*bring*" the sleepers; [2] by whom "God" will raise the dead; and [3] the *time* when the work shall be accomplished.

Landis, in his review of Prof. Bush on this passage, gives the following just criticism:

"His theory makes the dead saint not sleeping, but awaking; and this he expresses in so many words in remarking on Ps. 17: 15—'I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.' This awaking, says he, is the entrance upon the resurrection state at death. When the believer is raised from the dead, he is therefore neither *dead* nor asleep; but truly and properly *awake.* How, then, can all these saints of whom Paul speaks be *asleep* when Christ comes, when, according to the Professor, they are *awake* and already raised from the dead? These remarks will enable the reader fully to appreciate the following labored criticism of Prof. Bush, in which he gives one of the most ludicrous perversions of language that I have lately met with. After making the following observation, 'But here an objection would at once occur: How can they come with him, unless previously they were with him?' he says: 'This natural query the apostle proceeds to obviate in the sentence as follows: "The dead in Christ [*i. e.*, those that have slept in him] shall rise first;" *i. e.*, shall rise, or shall have arisen, previously.... The evidence, therefore, may be considered strong, that this is the true sense of the term in this connection, and the clause, being thrown in for the purpose of meeting a tacit objection, ought to have been enclosed in a parenthesis. The whole passage will then read thus: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God (and the dead in Christ shall have previously arisen); then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds [*i. e.*, in multitudes], to meet the Lord in the air." The phrase "shall be caught up together with them" means not in this view so properly that *we shall be caught up when they were already descending with Christ from heaven*; but simply, we shall be caught up to be with them.'"

Mr. Landis well says, this is "a huge display of criticism and learning;" and adds:

"And yet upon the foregoing poor misconstruction of the passage our author builds his astounding criticism. He does not, however, venture to explain how the risen saints are *both asleep and awake* (as his theory makes them) at one and the same time. The Professor makes the question to be, 'With what bodies do the *dead* come down from heaven?' It is strange that even the wording of this did not show him its absurdity, according to his theory. For according to the Professor, when *the dead come down from heaven, they are not dead,* any more than we are, and not as much; for they have been '*raised from the dead,*' he says, and to call them *dead,* therefore, is preposterous."

While Mr. Landis thus severely, and we must say justly, criticises and censures Prof. Bush's absurd interpretation of this passage, we see no material difference between the Professor's view and that, taking the Church at large, generally held as the popular faith respecting its teaching. For it is maintained that the sentence, "Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him," refers to the *souls* of the departed dead, which it is claimed do not die; and that they accompany our Lord to the earth, "at the last day," to resume their bodies. If so, then the souls are *asleep* as they descend from heaven! As inquired a good brother of a clergyman who was endeavoring to give the profound interpretation, that "Christ would bring the souls with him to put into the bodies of his saints," "Are the souls *asleep,* brother?" to which he could give no consistent reply. However, with a right understanding of the text, as explained by the Apostle himself, as we have given, all is plain; and may we not exclaim with Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead!"

UMI

tory passage (v. 14), is necessary to a right apprehension of the gospel hope.

"*Will God bring with him.*" The Apostle explains this sentence in his other epistles. He says: "The God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus," etc. (Heb. 13: 20.) And again: "Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up *us* also *by* Jesus." (2 Cor. 4: 14.) We therefore conclude with him: "Even so, them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring ["again from the dead," as he "brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus"] *with him*," or "*by Jesus.*" Hence he proceeds to affirm: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." (v. 16–18.) Thus the Apostle makes plain [1] from *whence* he will "*bring*" the sleepers; [2] by whom "God" will raise the dead; and [3] the *time* when the work shall be accomplished.

Landis, in his review of Prof. Bush on this passage, gives the following just criticism:

"His theory makes the dead saint not sleeping, but awaking; and this he expresses in so many words in remarking on Ps. 17: 15—'I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.' This awaking, says he, is the entrance upon the resurrection state at death. When the believer is raised from the dead, he is therefore neither *dead* nor asleep; but truly and properly *awake.* How, then, can all these saints of whom Paul speaks be *asleep* when Christ comes, when, according to the Professor, they are *awake* and already raised from the dead? These remarks will enable the reader fully to appreciate the following labored criticism of Prof. Bush, in which he gives one of the most ludicrous perversions of language that I have lately met with. After making the following observation, 'But here an objection would at once occur: How can they come with him, unless previously they were with him?' he says: 'This natural query the apostle proceeds to obviate in the sentence as follows: "The dead in Christ [*i. e.*, those that have slept in him] shall rise first;" *i. e.*, shall rise, or shall have arisen, previously.... The evidence, therefore, may be considered strong, that this is the true sense of the term in this connection, and the clause, being thrown in for the purpose of meeting a tacit objection, ought to have been enclosed in a parenthesis. The whole passage will then read thus: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God (and the dead in Christ shall have previously arisen); then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds [*i. e.*, in multitudes], to meet the Lord in the air." The phrase "shall be caught up together with them" means not in this view so properly that *we shall be caught up when they were already descending with Christ from heaven*; but simply, we shall be caught up to be with them.'"

Mr. Landis well says, this is "a huge display of criticism and learning;" and adds:

"And yet upon the foregoing poor misconstruction of the passage our author builds his astounding criticism. He does not, however, venture to explain how the risen saints are *both asleep and awake* (as his theory makes them) at one and the same time. The Professor makes the question to be, 'With what bodies do the *dead* come down from heaven?' It is strange that even the wording of this did not show him its absurdity, according to his theory. For according to the Professor, when *the dead come down from heaven, they are not dead,* any more than we are, and not as much; for they have been '*raised from the dead,*' he says, and to call them *dead,* therefore, is preposterous."

While Mr. Landis thus severely, and we must say justly, criticises and censures Prof. Bush's absurd interpretation of this passage, we see no material difference between the Professor's view and that, taking the Church at large, generally held as the popular faith respecting its teaching. For it is maintained that the sentence, "Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him," refers to the *souls* of the departed dead, which it is claimed do not die; and that they accompany our Lord to the earth, "at the last day," to resume their bodies. If so, then the souls are *asleep* as they descend from heaven! As inquired a good brother of a clergyman who was endeavoring to give the profound interpretation, that "Christ would bring the souls with him to put into the bodies of his saints," "Are the souls *asleep,* brother?" to which he could give no consistent reply. However, with a right understanding of the text, as explained by the Apostle himself, as we have given, all is plain; and may we not exclaim with Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead!"

UMI

(1 Pet. 1 : 3.) And do we not see the force of Paul's reasoning: "If Christ be not raised," "and the dead rise not," "then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." (1 Cor. 15 : 12–18.) And hence we must conclude with him, that as to any hope of future existence beyond this life, not dependent upon the resurrection from the dead, as conjectured by some of the heathen philosophers, it is not worth a thought; nor does it constitute any part of the gospel hope as set forth by him, or any other of the sacred writers.

The Christian world at large have involved this "blessed hope," "the resurrection," in great obscurity: and almost lost sight of it by substituting another; and that is, of "dying and going to heaven;" or "going to heaven at death." The sacred Scriptures speak of the departed dead as having "fallen asleep"—"which are asleep"—"Lazarus sleepeth"—"David fell on sleep"—"the sleepers in the dust of the earth"—"we shall not all sleep," etc., etc. And this is the uniform Scriptural phraseology concerning the state of the dead. But a modern divine, or Christian writer, or speaker, would not content himself with this language so unmeaning, to his notion, and so inconsistent with his theology learned at the schools; but the language chosen is, the dead are "gone to heaven"—"they are in glory"—"they have entered into reward"—and "are in the regions of the blessed"—"in the spirit land."

Who cannot perceive the difference between the Scriptural and primitive language used respecting "the dead in Christ," and the more modern phraseology? and that this difference is expressive of a wide diversity of ideas concerning the departed dead? The sacred writers view the dead as "sleepers in the dust," awaiting the awakening "at the last day." Modern theologians and writers look upon them as those neither *dead* nor *asleep* in "the dust of the earth," but both *alive* and *awake*, and virtually needing no resurrection from the dead, or awakening.

To support and confirm this idea and hope respecting "the dead in Christ," certain texts of the Scriptures are disjointed, and wrested, and perverted from their connection, and a meaning put upon them never intended by the sacred writers or speakers; as, for instance, Luke 23 : 43. This is invariably quoted without its context, v. 42. It is Christ's language to the penitent thief: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." I have heard, however, of a single exception to the above

remark: of a clergyman who said: "It is true that the penitent thief prayed, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom!' but the Lord immediately corrected him, and told him that he need not wait until then—Even 'to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise!'" Half the truth is by this exposition now confessed; and that is, that the thief prayed understandingly and Scripturally (Dan. 7 : 13, 14; 2 Tim. 4 : 1); and I think the other will have to be when our translators are willing to transfer the comma after the word "thee," and put it, where it belongs, after "to-day;" thus: "Verily I say unto thee to-day,—Thou shalt be with me in Paradise:" which would be a consistent reply to the petitioner's prayer, and agreeable to the teachings of the Scriptures as to the period of rewards. And why not do this, as well as to have changed within a dozen years, as all Bible Societies have done, the comma after the word "regeneration," and put it after the pronoun "me," in Matt. 19 : 28? So that the passage now reads far differently, and more consistently with a true theolgy: "Ye who have followed me,—in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory," etc. We demand the same change in punctuation of Luke 23 : 43, in the name of a true and unperverted Scriptural theology.

Phil. 1 : 22, 23 is interpreted so as to make Paul contradict himself in his own writings, and so confuse the mind as to lose sight of his only "blessed hope," and "earnest expectation." "*To die is gain.*" This is made to refer to the advantage of the believer in the condition of death; making death a blessing instead of a curse or penalty of violated law! And Paul's inquiry, "What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" is wholly inconsistent, as well as his language, "If Christ be not raised"—"if the dead rise not at all"—"then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." (1 Cor. 15 : 18–32.)

"*Having a desire to depart* and be with Christ," is interpreted to make Paul again contradict himself when he says of the intermediate state: "*Not* for that we would be unclothed." In the one place *desiring* the condition "far better," in the other *not desiring* it at all!! How much better this classification: "Earnestly desiring to be clothed upon—that mortality might be swallowed up of life." (2 Cor. 5 : 2, 4; 1 Cor. 15 : 51, 54.) "Earnest expectation and my hope—having a desire to depart and be

(1 Pet. 1 : 3.) And do we not see the force of Paul's reasoning: "If Christ be not raised," "and the dead rise not," "then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." (1 Cor. 15 : 12–18.) And hence we must conclude with him, that as to any hope of future existence beyond this life, not dependent upon the resurrection from the dead, as conjectured by some of the heathen philosophers, it is not worth a thought; nor does it constitute any part of the gospel hope as set forth by him, or any other of the sacred writers.

The Christian world at large have involved this "blessed hope," "the resurrection," in great obscurity: and almost lost sight of it by substituting another; and that is, of "dying and going to heaven;" or "going to heaven at death." The sacred Scriptures speak of the departed dead as having "fallen asleep"—"which are asleep"—"Lazarus sleepeth"—"David fell on sleep"—"the sleepers in the dust of the earth"—"we shall not all sleep," etc., etc. And this is the uniform Scriptural phraseology concerning the state of the dead. But a modern divine, or Christian writer, or speaker, would not content himself with this language so unmeaning, to his notion, and so inconsistent with his theology learned at the schools; but the language chosen is, the dead are "gone to heaven"—"they are in glory"—"they have entered into reward"—and "are in the regions of the blessed"—"in the spirit land."

Who cannot perceive the difference between the Scriptural and primitive language used respecting "the dead in Christ," and the more modern phraseology? and that this difference is expressive of a wide diversity of ideas concerning the departed dead? The sacred writers view the dead as "sleepers in the dust," awaiting the awakening "at the last day." Modern theologians and writers look upon them as those neither *dead* nor *asleep* in "the dust of the earth," but both *alive* and *awake*, and virtually needing no resurrection from the dead, or awakening.

To support and confirm this idea and hope respecting "the dead in Christ," certain texts of the Scriptures are disjointed, and wrested, and perverted from their connection, and a meaning put upon them never intended by the sacred writers or speakers; as, for instance, Luke 23 : 43. This is invariably quoted without its context, v. 42. It is Christ's language to the penitent thief: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." I have heard, however, of a single exception to the above

remark: of a clergyman who said: "It is true that the penitent thief prayed, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom!' but the Lord immediately corrected him, and told him that he need not wait until then—Even 'to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise!'" Half the truth is by this exposition now confessed; and that is, that the thief prayed understandingly and Scripturally (Dan. 7 : 13, 14; 2 Tim. 4 : 1); and I think the other will have to be when our translators are willing to transfer the comma after the word "thee," and put it, where it belongs, after "to-day;" thus: "Verily I say unto thee to-day,—Thou shalt be with me in Paradise:" which would be a consistent reply to the petitioner's prayer, and agreeable to the teachings of the Scriptures as to the period of rewards. And why not do this, as well as to have changed within a dozen years, as all Bible Societies have done, the comma after the word "regeneration," and put it after the pronoun "me," in Matt. 19 : 28? So that the passage now reads far differently, and more consistently with a true theolgy: "Ye who have followed me,—in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory," etc. We demand the same change in punctuation of Luke 23 : 43, in the name of a true and unperverted Scriptural theology.

Phil. 1 : 22, 23 is interpreted so as to make Paul contradict himself in his own writings, and so confuse the mind as to lose sight of his only "blessed hope," and "earnest expectation." "*To die is gain.*" This is made to refer to the advantage of the believer in the condition of death; making death a blessing instead of a curse or penalty of violated law! And Paul's inquiry, "What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" is wholly inconsistent, as well as his language, "If Christ be not raised"—"if the dead rise not at all"—"then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." (1 Cor. 15 : 18–32.)

"*Having a desire to depart* and be with Christ," is interpreted to make Paul again contradict himself when he says of the intermediate state: "*Not* for that we would be unclothed." In the one place *desiring* the condition "far better," in the other *not desiring* it at all!! How much better this classification: "Earnestly desiring to be clothed upon—that mortality might be swallowed up of life." (2 Cor. 5 : 2, 4; 1 Cor. 15 : 51, 54.) "Earnest expectation and my hope—having a desire to depart and be

with Christ; which is far better." (Phil. 1:20 23. Compare 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.) "Far better" than what? A condition of "life" or "death," or a state of mortality (Phil. 1:20), between which to "choose I wot not." (v. 22.) There are three conditions of which he speaks: "life," "death," and being "with Christ"—not in an "unclothed" condition, as the heathen and Spiritists conceive; but in glorified person. And this was his "earnest expectation and hope." (v. 20.) He was determined while he lived "Christ" should "be magnified" in his "body" by his "life;" and in the event of his death, that it should be "*gain*" and "advantage" also to Christ, as his martyr death has been.

2 Cor. 5:1–10 is interpreted so as to make "the undying soul" enter into a new "*house*," or "*body*," at death; and so blurs the conception of the glorious hope of the resurrection of "the vile" or humbled "body" into the likeness of the glorified body of our risen Lord. (Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor., ch. 15.) And there is an endeavor to make it appear, that as to the "*identity* of the resurrected body, it is not a question of much practical value."[1]

Of course! What does the soul want of two "houses" in which to live, or two "bodies" when, too, it is maintained that bodies are "clogs" to the soul? And in the event of the resurrection of the *identical* body from "the dust of the earth" (Dan. 12:1–3), and from the "grave" (John, ch. 5), what is the soul to do with the body or house it entered at death? Will death be needful to divest it of that body in order to resume the old habitation made new? Or with these difficulties in this new theology, shall we not abandon altogether the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead? as some have done.

The following is the profound interpretation given in *The Sunday-school Instructor* for April, 1869, of 2 Cor., ch. 5:

"The soul lives in the body as we—our bodies and souls—live in a house or tent. It looks out of our eyes, which are the windows. It hears through our ears, and speaks by our tongues. Our bodies change, or must be laid away; therefore we should not love them too much. By and by our soul will leave the body. It will die, decay, and pass away, as have those of our friends, parents, brothers, or sisters....After death he will give us a glorious covering for our souls, a body fit to be in heaven, made by God....When the spirit of a little believing child leaves its body it will go to be with Jesus....In heaven we shall see him as he is, and be like him."

[1] *The National Sunday-school Teacher*, March, 1869.

Can there be considered a greater perversion of truth, or the meaning of the Scriptures than this? The regard that we should have for our bodies (1 Cor. 6:14, 15, 19, 20); the hope of the resurrection from the dead at the last day (1 Cor., ch. 15; John, ch. 6); the glorious restitution, and regenesis of our globe as the final happy abode of the just (Acts 3:21; Rom., ch. 8; 2 Pet., ch. 3; Rev., ch. 21); and the coming of our Redeemer, when we shall "see him as he is" (1 John 3:1–3); these are wholly ignored by such an interpretation of this Scripture!

The apostle does not say that "if our earthly houses of these tabernacles were dissolved, we have buildings of God, houses not made with hands," etc., which he would have said, substituting the plural for the singular, if he had been teaching the doctrine of these modern divines!

His subject matter began in the verse preceding (ch. 4:18), where he declares that the "things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal;" and thus contrasts the present with the future world and state beyond the final dissolution at the last day. Hence he adds: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved"—i. e., "things seen." "Seeing then that all these *things* shall be dissolved"—"the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat"—"the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up." (2 Pet. 3:10–12.)

"We have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." What building and house is this, which the fires will not reach, or dissolve? Ans.—"Abraham looked for a city—whose *builder* and *maker* is *God*." (Heb. 11:10.) And Jesus says: "In my Father's *house* are many mansions." (John 14:2.) And Paul says in another epistle: "Jerusalem which is above is free," etc. (Gal. 4:26.) And John hears the angel declaring it to be the "New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God." (Rev. 3:12.) And it is found finally in connection with the "new heavens and a new earth." (Rev., ch. 21.) If our modern theologians should let the Scriptures explain themselves, and be their own infallible interpreter, they would fall into fewer absurdities.

Tradition has added to the Scriptural doctrine of the resurrection and restitution that of the heathen philosophy of "the soul's immortality," and consequent rewards in death in remote

with Christ; which is far better." (Phil. 1:20 23. Compare 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.) "Far better" than what? A condition of "life" or "death," or a state of mortality (Phil. 1:20), between which to "choose I wot not." (v. 22.) There are three conditions of which he speaks: "life," "death," and being "with Christ"—not in an "unclothed" condition, as the heathen and Spiritists conceive; but in glorified person. And this was his "earnest expectation and hope." (v. 20.) He was determined while he lived "Christ" should "be magnified" in his "body" by his "life;" and in the event of his death, that it should be "*gain*" and "advantage" also to Christ, as his martyr death has been.

2 Cor. 5:1–10 is interpreted so as to make "the undying soul" enter into a new "*house*," or "*body*," at death; and so blurs the conception of the glorious hope of the resurrection of "the vile" or humbled "body" into the likeness of the glorified body of our risen Lord. (Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor., ch. 15.) And there is an endeavor to make it appear, that as to the "*identity* of the resurrected body, it is not a question of much practical value."[1]

Of course! What does the soul want of two "houses" in which to live, or two "bodies" when, too, it is maintained that bodies are "clogs" to the soul? And in the event of the resurrection of the *identical* body from "the dust of the earth" (Dan. 12:1–3), and from the "grave" (John, ch. 5), what is the soul to do with the body or house it entered at death? Will death be needful to divest it of that body in order to resume the old habitation made new? Or with these difficulties in this new theology, shall we not abandon altogether the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead? as some have done.

The following is the profound interpretation given in *The Sunday-school Instructor* for April, 1869, of 2 Cor., ch. 5:

"The soul lives in the body as we—our bodies and souls—live in a house or tent. It looks out of our eyes, which are the windows. It hears through our ears, and speaks by our tongues. Our bodies change, or must be laid away; therefore we should not love them too much. By and by our soul will leave the body. It will die, decay, and pass away, as have those of our friends, parents, brothers, or sisters....After death he will give us a glorious covering for our souls, a body fit to be in heaven, made by God....When the spirit of a little believing child leaves its body it will go to be with Jesus....In heaven we shall see him as he is, and be like him."

[1] *The National Sunday-school Teacher*, March, 1869.

Can there be considered a greater perversion of truth, or the meaning of the Scriptures than this? The regard that we should have for our bodies (1 Cor. 6:14, 15, 19, 20); the hope of the resurrection from the dead at the last day (1 Cor., ch. 15; John, ch. 6); the glorious restitution, and regenesis of our globe as the final happy abode of the just (Acts 3:21; Rom., ch. 8; 2 Pet., ch. 3; Rev., ch. 21); and the coming of our Redeemer, when we shall "see him as he is" (1 John 3:1–3); these are wholly ignored by such an interpretation of this Scripture!

The apostle does not say that "if our earthly houses of these tabernacles were dissolved, we have buildings of God, houses not made with hands," etc., which he would have said, substituting the plural for the singular, if he had been teaching the doctrine of these modern divines!

His subject matter began in the verse preceding (ch. 4:18), where he declares that the "things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal;" and thus contrasts the present with the future world and state beyond the final dissolution at the last day. Hence he adds: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved"—i. e., "things seen." "Seeing then that all these *things* shall be dissolved"—"the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat"—"the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up." (2 Pet. 3:10–12.)

"We have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." What building and house is this, which the fires will not reach, or dissolve? Ans.—"Abraham looked for a city—whose *builder* and *maker* is *God*." (Heb. 11:10.) And Jesus says: "In my Father's *house* are many mansions." (John 14:2.) And Paul says in another epistle: "Jerusalem which is above is free," etc. (Gal. 4:26.) And John hears the angel declaring it to be the "New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God." (Rev. 3:12.) And it is found finally in connection with the "new heavens and a new earth." (Rev., ch. 21.) If our modern theologians should let the Scriptures explain themselves, and be their own infallible interpreter, they would fall into fewer absurdities.

Tradition has added to the Scriptural doctrine of the resurrection and restitution that of the heathen philosophy of "the soul's immortality," and consequent rewards in death in remote

regions in the universe. This did the Jewish Church prior to the first advent of the Messiah. Says Gibbon:

"We might naturally suppose that a principle so essential to religion would have been revealed in the clearest terms to the chosen people of Palestine, and that it might safely have been entrusted to the hereditary priesthood of Aaron. It is incumbent on us to adore the mysterious dispensation of Providence when we discover that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is omitted in the law of Moses.

"To the authority of Scripture, the Pharisees added that of tradition, several speculative tenets from the philosophy or religion of the Eastern nations; and as the Pharisees, by their austerity of manners, had drawn into their party the body of the Jewish people, *the immortality of the soul* became the prevailing sentiment of the synagogue under the Asmonæan Princes and pontiffs." (vol. 1, p. 530–31.)

"This doctrine sprang from Greek philosophy. The ancient Hebrew writings contain no trace of it. Some Jews embraced the Hellenic culture, not to speak of the Jewish school of Egypt, in which attempts to amalgamate Hellenism and Judaism had been continued for nearly 200 years. Josephus furnishes us with a Jew completely Hellenized." (M. Renan, *Life of Jesus*, p. 74.)

The Christian Church, during the days of the apostasy, and the reign and supremacy of that corrupt form of Christianity, which became paganized—the Romish Church, also, incorporated the heathen doctrine of the soul's immortality into the faith of the gospel.

"The doctrine of the immortality of the soul was first tolerated in the Christian Church in the fifth century, being advocated by that remarkable man Synesius, who was bred in the Platonic school." (Hudson.)

Wm. Tyndall thus sharply rebukes the Papists of his day:

"Ye in putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory, destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good a case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of a resurrection? The true faith putteth the resurrection, which we are warned to look for every hour. The heathen philosophers denying this, did put that the soul did ever live; and the Pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ with the fleshly doctrine of philosophers together—things so contrary they cannot agree."

Thus we see that the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and a state of conscious rewards in death, is plainly an innovation on

the faith once delivered to the saints, being the incorporation of the heathen philosophy of a future state into the Christian system.

The doctrine of the resurrection from the dead is the doctrine of divine revelation, and constitutes the only sure hope concerning a future life. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not a doctrine taught by the inspired writers; but was one conjectured and guessed at, and taught by heathen philosophers, groping their way without divine revelation, and no light concerning a future state; and which they themselves hardly believed, and never could demonstrate either to their own satisfaction, or to the judgment of mankind, as there is abundant evidence to show.

"A doctrine thus removed beyond the senses, and the experience of mankind, might serve to amuse the leisure of a philosophic mind; or in the silence of solitude, it might sometimes impart a ray of comfort to desponding virtue: but the faint impression which had been received in the schools was soon obliterated by the commerce and business of active life. We are sufficiently acquainted with the eminent persons who flourished in the age of Cicero, and of the Cæsars, with their actions, their characters, and their motives, to be assured that their conduct in this life was never regulated by any serious conviction of the rewards or punishments of a future state. At the bar, and in the Senate of Rome, the ablest orators were not apprehensive of giving offence to their hearers, by exposing that doctrine as an idle and extravagant opinion, which was rejected with contempt by every man of a liberal education and understanding." (Gibbon, vol. 1, p. 528.)

Enlightened Christian believers, with the "lively oracles" in their possession, should not be "ignorant" of the divine purposes and promises respecting a future life; and they are not; and hence concerning "them which sleep in Jesus," they "sorrow not as others which have no hope."

I. *They do not sorrow as those who regard death as a state of eternal oblivion.*

The ancients invented the fabled "Fountain of Lethe," or oblivion: and Virgil in gloomy verse describes the naked and miserable ghosts driven to that fabled river, there to drink eternal forgetfulness. These heathen were so violent in their grief as to injure their own persons; and hence the Lord gave direction to Israel, thus: "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you; I am the Lord." (Lev. 19:

UMI

regions in the universe. This did the Jewish Church prior to the first advent of the Messiah. Says Gibbon:

"We might naturally suppose that a principle so essential to religion would have been revealed in the clearest terms to the chosen people of Palestine, and that it might safely have been entrusted to the hereditary priesthood of Aaron. It is incumbent on us to adore the mysterious dispensation of Providence when we discover that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is omitted in the law of Moses.

"To the authority of Scripture, the Pharisees added that of tradition, several speculative tenets from the philosophy or religion of the Eastern nations; and as the Pharisees, by their austerity of manners, had drawn into their party the body of the Jewish people, *the immortality of the soul* became the prevailing sentiment of the synagogue under the Asmonæan Princes and pontiffs." (vol. 1, p. 530–31.)

"This doctrine sprang from Greek philosophy. The ancient Hebrew writings contain no trace of it. Some Jews embraced the Hellenic culture, not to speak of the Jewish school of Egypt, in which attempts to amalgamate Hellenism and Judaism had been continued for nearly 200 years. Josephus furnishes us with a Jew completely Hellenized." (M. Renan, *Life of Jesus*, p. 74.)

The Christian Church, during the days of the apostasy, and the reign and supremacy of that corrupt form of Christianity, which became paganized—the Romish Church, also, incorporated the heathen doctrine of the soul's immortality into the faith of the gospel.

"The doctrine of the immortality of the soul was first tolerated in the Christian Church in the fifth century, being advocated by that remarkable man Synesius, who was bred in the Platonic school." (Hudson.)

Wm. Tyndall thus sharply rebukes the Papists of his day:

"Ye in putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory, destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good a case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of a resurrection? The true faith putteth the resurrection, which we are warned to look for every hour. The heathen philosophers denying this, did put that the soul did ever live; and the Pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ with the fleshly doctrine of philosophers together—things so contrary they cannot agree."

Thus we see that the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and a state of conscious rewards in death, is plainly an innovation on

the faith once delivered to the saints, being the incorporation of the heathen philosophy of a future state into the Christian system.

The doctrine of the resurrection from the dead is the doctrine of divine revelation, and constitutes the only sure hope concerning a future life. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not a doctrine taught by the inspired writers; but was one conjectured and guessed at, and taught by heathen philosophers, groping their way without divine revelation, and no light concerning a future state; and which they themselves hardly believed, and never could demonstrate either to their own satisfaction, or to the judgment of mankind, as there is abundant evidence to show.

"A doctrine thus removed beyond the senses, and the experience of mankind, might serve to amuse the leisure of a philosophic mind; or in the silence of solitude, it might sometimes impart a ray of comfort to desponding virtue: but the faint impression which had been received in the schools was soon obliterated by the commerce and business of active life. We are sufficiently acquainted with the eminent persons who flourished in the age of Cicero, and of the Cæsars, with their actions, their characters, and their motives, to be assured that their conduct in this life was never regulated by any serious conviction of the rewards or punishments of a future state. At the bar, and in the Senate of Rome, the ablest orators were not apprehensive of giving offence to their hearers, by exposing that doctrine as an idle and extravagant opinion, which was rejected with contempt by every man of a liberal education and understanding." (Gibbon, vol. 1, p. 528.)

Enlightened Christian believers, with the "lively oracles" in their possession, should not be "ignorant" of the divine purposes and promises respecting a future life; and they are not; and hence concerning "them which sleep in Jesus," they "sorrow not as others which have no hope."

I. *They do not sorrow as those who regard death as a state of eternal oblivion.*

The ancients invented the fabled "Fountain of Lethe," or oblivion: and Virgil in gloomy verse describes the naked and miserable ghosts driven to that fabled river, there to drink eternal forgetfulness. These heathen were so violent in their grief as to injure their own persons; and hence the Lord gave direction to Israel, thus: "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you; I am the Lord." (Lev. 19:

UMI

28.) "Ye are the children of the Lord your God. Ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead." (Deut. 14: 1.)

"The heathen nations not only did these things in honor of their gods, but in grief for the death of a relative. The Scythians, as we are informed by Herodotus, were accustomed to slash themselves on the death of their king: and Virgil represents the sister of Dido tearing her face with nails, and beating her breasts with her fists. The Persians even now cut and lacerate themselves when celebrating the assassination of Hossein." (Bagster's note on Deut. 14: 1.)

Sir J. Chardin says:

"Concerning the people of Asia, their sentiments of joy or grief are, properly, transports; and their transports are ungoverned, excessive, and outrageous. When one returns from a long journey, or dies, his family burst into cries that may be heard twenty doors off. Especially are those cries long in the case of death, and frightful; for their mourning is right down despair, and an 'image of hell.'" (*Cottage Bible;* note on Gen. 50: 10.)

Cicero endeavored to believe in the conscious survivance of the soul after death, and its immortality as taught by Plato; but abandoning this as the best light and only hope he had of a future life, in his heathenism, without the gospel and gospel hope, he became bewildered and sorrowful in the contemplation of man's mortality. And on the death of a beloved daughter, whom he loved with all the fondness of parental affection, in the thought of her being consigned to endless oblivion, sad and disheartened, he retired to a private and secluded retreat for the rest of his days, and neither the earnest entreaties of personal friends nor the demands of his country, which he greatly loved, as her most eminent statesmen, even in the misfortunes of the State, could draw him from his pensive retirement. Here is a man of the first genius and powers of intellect bending under the weight of grief, from which he never recovers, as a sad illustration of one who sorrowed having "no hope" for his departed dead!

A Greek poet of master mind writes his own pitiful lament in the following verse:

"The meanest herb we trample in the field,
Or in the garden nurture, when its leaf
In Autumn dies, forebodes another Spring,
And from brief slumbers wakes to life again.

Man wakes no more! Man, valiant, peerless, wise,
Once chilled by death, sleeps hopeless in the dust,
A long, unbroken, never-ending sleep."

When one visits the places of burial and sepulture of the Ancients, and those who have laid away their dead without hope of a future life, and reads upon the monuments and tomb-stones the inscriptions expressive of the sorrow and grief of surviving relatives and friends over their deceased, they cannot but be struck with the affliction which must have haunted their saddened minds and hearts, as they buried their dead without hope.

Prof. G. W. Green, for many years U. S. Consul at Rome, says:

"You cannot take ten steps in the Lapidarian Gallery of the Vatican without feeling that you are standing between two worlds. On one side are the inscriptions of paganism, whose dead, sinking into their graves without hope, seem to cast back lingering glances upon the pleasures they have left behind. The mourner has nothing to console him, the dying man nothing to cling to; but when the name has once issued from the fatal urn, he leaves forever his woods, his villas, and his home for the bark that is to bear him to an eternal exile. Then from his tomb comes a cold voice that chills you by its heartlessness; and idle enumeration of idle pleasures, or a spiteful warning that yours too will soon be ended."

He gives us several examples, some of which we here transcribe:

D·M·

TI CLAUDI SECUNDI. HIC SECUM HABET OMNIA BALNEA VINUM VENUS CORRUMPUNT CORPORA NOSTRA SED VITAM FACIUNT.

B·V·V·

"To the divine manes of Titus Claudius Secundus. Here [in this world], he has with him everything. Baths, wine, and lust ruin our constitution, but they constitute life what it is. Farewell—farewell."

Prof. Green well exclaims:

"What language for the grave! You remember the dying question of Augustus to his friends: 'Have I played my part well? Then applaud me.' Shocking as this is to our conceptions, even from such a wretch as Augustus, the following inscription is still more so:

"VIXI DUM VIXI BENEJAM MEA PERACTA MOX VESTRA AGETUR FABULA VALETE ET PLAUDITE.

"V·A·N·LVIII·

28.) "Ye are the children of the Lord your God. Ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead." (Deut. 14: 1.)

"The heathen nations not only did these things in honor of their gods, but in grief for the death of a relative. The Scythians, as we are informed by Herodotus, were accustomed to slash themselves on the death of their king: and Virgil represents the sister of Dido tearing her face with nails, and beating her breasts with her fists. The Persians even now cut and lacerate themselves when celebrating the assassination of Hossein." (Bagster's note on Deut. 14: 1.)

Sir J. Chardin says:

"Concerning the people of Asia, their sentiments of joy or grief are, properly, transports; and their transports are ungoverned, excessive, and outrageous. When one returns from a long journey, or dies, his family burst into cries that may be heard twenty doors off. Especially are those cries long in the case of death, and frightful; for their mourning is right down despair, and an 'image of hell.'" (*Cottage Bible;* note on Gen. 50: 10.)

Cicero endeavored to believe in the conscious survivance of the soul after death, and its immortality as taught by Plato; but abandoning this as the best light and only hope he had of a future life, in his heathenism, without the gospel and gospel hope, he became bewildered and sorrowful in the contemplation of man's mortality. And on the death of a beloved daughter, whom he loved with all the fondness of parental affection, in the thought of her being consigned to endless oblivion, sad and disheartened, he retired to a private and secluded retreat for the rest of his days, and neither the earnest entreaties of personal friends nor the demands of his country, which he greatly loved, as her most eminent statesmen, even in the misfortunes of the State, could draw him from his pensive retirement. Here is a man of the first genius and powers of intellect bending under the weight of grief, from which he never recovers, as a sad illustration of one who sorrowed having "no hope" for his departed dead!

A Greek poet of master mind writes his own pitiful lament in the following verse:

"The meanest herb we trample in the field,
Or in the garden nurture, when its leaf
In Autumn dies, forebodes another Spring,
And from brief slumbers wakes to life again.

Man wakes no more! Man, valiant, peerless, wise,
Once chilled by death, sleeps hopeless in the dust,
A long, unbroken, never-ending sleep."

When one visits the places of burial and sepulture of the Ancients, and those who have laid away their dead without hope of a future life, and reads upon the monuments and tomb-stones the inscriptions expressive of the sorrow and grief of surviving relatives and friends over their deceased, they cannot but be struck with the affliction which must have haunted their saddened minds and hearts, as they buried their dead without hope.

Prof. G. W. Green, for many years U. S. Consul at Rome, says:

"You cannot take ten steps in the Lapidarian Gallery of the Vatican without feeling that you are standing between two worlds. On one side are the inscriptions of paganism, whose dead, sinking into their graves without hope, seem to cast back lingering glances upon the pleasures they have left behind. The mourner has nothing to console him, the dying man nothing to cling to; but when the name has once issued from the fatal urn, he leaves forever his woods, his villas, and his home for the bark that is to bear him to an eternal exile. Then from his tomb comes a cold voice that chills you by its heartlessness; and idle enumeration of idle pleasures, or a spiteful warning that yours too will soon be ended."

He gives us several examples, some of which we here transcribe:

D·M·

TI CLAUDI SECUNDI. HIC SECUM HABET OMNIA BALNEA VINUM VENUS CORRUMPUNT CORPORA NOSTRA SED VITAM FACIUNT.

B·V·V·

"To the divine manes of Titus Claudius Secundus. Here [in this world], he has with him everything. Baths, wine, and lust ruin our constitution, but they constitute life what it is. Farewell—farewell."

Prof. Green well exclaims:

"What language for the grave! You remember the dying question of Augustus to his friends: 'Have I played my part well? Then applaud me.' Shocking as this is to our conceptions, even from such a wretch as Augustus, the following inscription is still more so:

"VIXI DUM VIXI BENEJAM MEA PERACTA MOX VESTRA AGETUR FABULA VALETE ET PLAUDITE.

"V·A·N·LVIII·

"While I lived, I lived well. My play is now ended: soon yours will be. Farewell, and applaud me!"

In a volume entitled the *Catacombs of Rome*, published by the "American Sunday-school Union," I find the following examples:

A disconsolate mother thus bemoans her lost child:

CAIUS JULIUS MAXIMUS. Æ. TWO YEARS AND FIVE MONTHS. O RELENTLESS FORTUNE, WHO DELIGHTED IN CRUEL DEATH! WHY IS MAXIMUS SO EARLY SNATCHED FROM ME—HE WHO LATELY USED TO LIE BELOVED, ON MY BOSOM! THIS STONE NOW MARKS HIS TOMB. BEHOLD HIS MOTHER!

And here is another similar inscription of lamentation over a son by an affectionate and bereaved mother:

HIS MOTHER FUSCA, LEFT TO SORROW AND GROANING, BURIED HIM, MOIST WITH TEARS AND BALSAM, IN THIS SEPULCHRE.

Oh! how much these bereaved mothers needed the comforting hope of the gospel as they sorrowed because "their children were not," and supposed death to be an eternal extinction of being. How consoling would the words of the prophet to weeping Rachel have been to them, had they heard their announcement:

"Thus saith the Lord: Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border." (Jer. 31:16, 17.)

Coming down to later times, it is said of Gibbon, the celebrated historian of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, who had his mind early tinctured with the principles of infidelity, and who discarded the doctrine of the soul's immortality as taught by the heathen world, and discredited the revealed doctrine of the resurrection from the dead to a future life; that "he left this world in gloomy despondency without those hopes and consolations which cheer the Christian in the prospect of immortality."

Hume has the following remarkable passage in his treatise on human nature, which betrays his unanchored hopes:

"I am affrighted and confounded with that forlorn solitude in which I am placed by my philosophy. When I look abroad, I foresee, on every side, dispute, contradiction, and distraction. When I turn my eye inward, I find nothing but doubt and ignorance. Where am I, or what? From what causes do I derive my existence, and to what condition shall I return? I am confounded with these questions, and begin to fancy myself in a most deplorable condition imaginable, environed with the deepest darkness."

Diderot, when dying, after a life of doubt, skepticism, and disappointment, said to his friends who stood by his bed-side to close his eyes in death, "I am about to take a leap in the dark." And dark, indeed, is "the land of darkness and the shadow of death," without the gospel hope.

Lord Byron, who sought for happiness only in the vanities and pleasures of a sinful life, but was disappointed at every step, endeavors to find comfort in the thought of future oblivion in death. He writes:

"Ay, but to die, and go alas!
Where all have gone, and all must go;
To be the nothing that I was
Ere born to life and living wo!
Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen;
Count o'er the days from anguish free;
And know, whatever thou hast been,
'Tis something better not to be!
Nay, for myself, so dark my fate
Through every turn of life hath been,
Man and the world so much I hate,
I care not when I quit the scene."

But how little comfort could this give him, when he penned the following lines, which must have been the utterance of the deeper convictions and emotions of his heart, which were found written in his Bible after his death:

"Within this awful volume lies
The mystery of mysteries;
Oh! happiest they of human race,
To whom our God has given grace
To hear, to read, to fear, to pray,
To lift the latch, and force the way;
But better had they ne'er been born,
Who read to doubt, or read to scorn!"

In view of burying our dead, or departing this life only to pass into eternal oblivion, we may well say with the Apostle we "sorrow not" as they. And our American poet has well

UMI

"While I lived, I lived well. My play is now ended: soon yours will be. Farewell, and applaud me!"

In a volume entitled the *Catacombs of Rome*, published by the "American Sunday-school Union," I find the following examples:

A disconsolate mother thus bemoans her lost child:

CAIUS JULIUS MAXIMUS. Æ. TWO YEARS AND FIVE MONTHS. O RELENTLESS FORTUNE, WHO DELIGHTED IN CRUEL DEATH! WHY IS MAXIMUS SO EARLY SNATCHED FROM ME—HE WHO LATELY USED TO LIE BELOVED, ON MY BOSOM! THIS STONE NOW MARKS HIS TOMB. BEHOLD HIS MOTHER!

And here is another similar inscription of lamentation over a son by an affectionate and bereaved mother:

HIS MOTHER FUSCA, LEFT TO SORROW AND GROANING, BURIED HIM, MOIST WITH TEARS AND BALSAM, IN THIS SEPULCHRE.

Oh! how much these bereaved mothers needed the comforting hope of the gospel as they sorrowed because "their children were not," and supposed death to be an eternal extinction of being. How consoling would the words of the prophet to weeping Rachel have been to them, had they heard their announcement:

"Thus saith the Lord: Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border." (Jer. 31:16, 17.)

Coming down to later times, it is said of Gibbon, the celebrated historian of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, who had his mind early tinctured with the principles of infidelity, and who discarded the doctrine of the soul's immortality as taught by the heathen world, and discredited the revealed doctrine of the resurrection from the dead to a future life; that "he left this world in gloomy despondency without those hopes and consolations which cheer the Christian in the prospect of immortality."

Hume has the following remarkable passage in his treatise on human nature, which betrays his unanchored hopes:

"I am affrighted and confounded with that forlorn solitude in which I am placed by my philosophy. When I look abroad, I foresee, on every side, dispute, contradiction, and distraction. When I turn my eye inward, I find nothing but doubt and ignorance. Where am I, or what? From what causes do I derive my existence, and to what condition shall I return? I am confounded with these questions, and begin to fancy myself in a most deplorable condition imaginable, environed with the deepest darkness."

Diderot, when dying, after a life of doubt, skepticism, and disappointment, said to his friends who stood by his bed-side to close his eyes in death, "I am about to take a leap in the dark." And dark, indeed, is "the land of darkness and the shadow of death," without the gospel hope.

Lord Byron, who sought for happiness only in the vanities and pleasures of a sinful life, but was disappointed at every step, endeavors to find comfort in the thought of future oblivion in death. He writes:

"Ay, but to die, and go alas!
Where all have gone, and all must go;
To be the nothing that I was
Ere born to life and living wo!
Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen;
Count o'er the days from anguish free;
And know, whatever thou hast been,
'Tis something better not to be!
Nay, for myself, so dark my fate
Through every turn of life hath been,
Man and the world so much I hate,
I care not when I quit the scene."

But how little comfort could this give him, when he penned the following lines, which must have been the utterance of the deeper convictions and emotions of his heart, which were found written in his Bible after his death:

"Within this awful volume lies
The mystery of mysteries;
Oh! happiest they of human race,
To whom our God has given grace
To hear, to read, to fear, to pray,
To lift the latch, and force the way;
But better had they ne'er been born,
Who read to doubt, or read to scorn!"

In view of burying our dead, or departing this life only to pass into eternal oblivion, we may well say with the Apostle we "sorrow not" as they. And our American poet has well

UMI

expressed the sad reflections and unassuaged grief of those who anticipate so dark a fate:

"Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine thro' his Cypress trees!
Who hopeless lays his dead away,
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play."—*Whittier.*

II. *Christian believers sorrow not as those who endeavor to find comfort in the false hope of the soul's immortality.*

The ancient Egyptian funeral rites gave rise to the fables which were afterwards improved upon by the Greeks, of the river Styx, Charon and his boat, in which the supposed spirits of the dead were ferried to "Elysian Fields."

"Here [Memphis, Egypt] was the famous Acherian lake; now a solitary marsh and a dirty pool of water are all that remain. Here was a beautiful sheet of water, fed by canals; its shores ornamented by shady groves and beautiful parks. These were the waters over which the dead were ferried to yonder tombs and sepulchres. To this lake the mummied dead corpse was brought. Forty-two persons, constituted judges, ranged themselves around the remains of the departed one. 'Has any one ought to allege against the character of the deceased?' In the scales of justice his life was balanced. If it was proved that he had spent his life in dissipation and vice, transit was denied him till his friends could atone for him. Those Elysian fields, and those quiet shades of the departed, were for the good alone. If accepted, the ferryman received the pious freight, and bore it beyond the flood.

"These obsequies of the dead seem to have been emblematic of their ideas of future judgment and retribution. I saw in Dr. Abbot's Museum, in New York, a magnificent funeral papyrus roll, twenty-two feet long, taken from one of the very tombs of yonder great cemetery..... The deceased is held supported by two or more gods. In another place in the roll is a picture of the hall of the 'Two Truths,' with the god Osiris sitting in judgment, assisted by the forty-two judges, standing near him. Before him stands the soul of the deceased, accompanied by Anubis, the guardian of the tombs, and the Ibis-headed god Thoth. This god has been writing down the history of the departed, and has collected all his good deeds. The result is made known by the god Thoth to Osiris, who awards such punishment as he and his forty-two assistants deem best.

"That lake and those judgment scenes have lessons for us. Vividly do they remind us of the Christian's Jordan of death, and our transit to the presence of the great Judge of all the earth, and the solemn awards of an impartial tribunal. Many of these singular customs, connected with the dead, might afford us lessons of instruction now." (*Handwriting of God*, pp. 183, 184.)

Thus, we perceive, we have the origin of the fables respecting the judgment at death, and the rewards of the dead in "Elysian Fields" immediately on decease, and their ferriage across the "river." And have not "these singular customs connected with the dead," among the ancients, afforded "lessons of instruction now;" and the "River Styx" been converted into "the Christian's Jordan of death, and our transit into the presence of the great Judge of all the earth; and the solemn awards of an impartial tribunal," at death?

Dr. Young sings:

"Man's hour is up, and we are gone;
Our little bark is burst on Charon's shore."

And these, otherwise beautiful, verses sung in nearly all Christian congregations, illustrate the same fact:

"There is a land of pure delight,
Where saints immortal reign;
Where endless day excludes the night,
And pleasures banish pain."

This is true of the "new earth," and "the world to come;" but of no "spirit land!"

"There everlasting spring abides,
And never withering flowers."

Yes, this is true in the restitution.

"Death, like a narrow sea, divides
That heavenly land from ours."

To most of the saints, the sea is wide, and they are still in it, uncrossed.

"Sweet fields beyond the swelling flood,
Stand dressed in living green;
So to the Jews old Canaan stood.
While Jordan rolled between."

Those sweet and heavenly fields, prospective before the Christian's eye of faith, are indeed "beyond Jordan;" *i. e.*, the river of Judgment, and not the "River of Death."

"But timorous mortals start and shrink
To cross this narrow sea;
And linger shivering on the brink,
And fear to launch away."

UMI

expressed the sad reflections and unassuaged grief of those who anticipate so dark a fate:

"Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine thro' his Cypress trees!
Who hopeless lays his dead away,
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play."—*Whittier.*

II. *Christian believers sorrow not as those who endeavor to find comfort in the false hope of the soul's immortality.*

The ancient Egyptian funeral rites gave rise to the fables which were afterwards improved upon by the Greeks, of the river Styx, Charon and his boat, in which the supposed spirits of the dead were ferried to "Elysian Fields."

"Here [Memphis, Egypt] was the famous Acherian lake; now a solitary marsh and a dirty pool of water are all that remain. Here was a beautiful sheet of water, fed by canals; its shores ornamented by shady groves and beautiful parks. These were the waters over which the dead were ferried to yonder tombs and sepulchres. To this lake the mummied dead corpse was brought. Forty-two persons, constituted judges, ranged themselves around the remains of the departed one. 'Has any one ought to allege against the character of the deceased?' In the scales of justice his life was balanced. If it was proved that he had spent his life in dissipation and vice, transit was denied him till his friends could atone for him. Those Elysian fields, and those quiet shades of the departed, were for the good alone. If accepted, the ferryman received the pious freight, and bore it beyond the flood.

"These obsequies of the dead seem to have been emblematic of their ideas of future judgment and retribution. I saw in Dr. Abbot's Museum, in New York, a magnificent funeral papyrus roll, twenty-two feet long, taken from one of the very tombs of yonder great cemetery..... The deceased is held supported by two or more gods. In another place in the roll is a picture of the hall of the 'Two Truths,' with the god Osiris sitting in judgment, assisted by the forty-two judges, standing near him. Before him stands the soul of the deceased, accompanied by Anubis, the guardian of the tombs, and the Ibis-headed god Thoth. This god has been writing down the history of the departed, and has collected all his good deeds. The result is made known by the god Thoth to Osiris, who awards such punishment as he and his forty-two assistants deem best.

"That lake and those judgment scenes have lessons for us. Vividly do they remind us of the Christian's Jordan of death, and our transit to the presence of the great Judge of all the earth, and the solemn awards of an impartial tribunal. Many of these singular customs, connected with the dead, might afford us lessons of instruction now." (*Handwriting of God*, pp. 183, 184.)

Thus, we perceive, we have the origin of the fables respecting the judgment at death, and the rewards of the dead in "Elysian Fields" immediately on decease, and their ferriage across the "river." And have not "these singular customs connected with the dead," among the ancients, afforded "lessons of instruction now;" and the "River Styx" been converted into "the Christian's Jordan of death, and our transit into the presence of the great Judge of all the earth; and the solemn awards of an impartial tribunal," at death?

Dr. Young sings:

"Man's hour is up, and we are gone;
Our little bark is burst on Charon's shore."

And these, otherwise beautiful, verses sung in nearly all Christian congregations, illustrate the same fact:

"There is a land of pure delight,
Where saints immortal reign;
Where endless day excludes the night,
And pleasures banish pain."

This is true of the "new earth," and "the world to come;" but of no "spirit land!"

"There everlasting spring abides,
And never withering flowers."

Yes, this is true in the restitution.

"Death, like a narrow sea, divides
That heavenly land from ours."

To most of the saints, the sea is wide, and they are still in it, uncrossed.

"Sweet fields beyond the swelling flood,
Stand dressed in living green;
So to the Jews old Canaan stood.
While Jordan rolled between."

Those sweet and heavenly fields, prospective before the Christian's eye of faith, are indeed "beyond Jordan;" *i. e.*, the river of Judgment, and not the "River of Death."

"But timorous mortals start and shrink
To cross this narrow sea;
And linger shivering on the brink,
And fear to launch away."

UMI

This is because for the judgment is substituted death, which is ever an enemy (1 Cor. 15:26), even to the saints!

"Could we but climb where Moses stood,
And view the landscape o'er;
Not Jordan's waves, nor death's cold flood,
Should fright us from the shore."

We can, if we will ascend the mount of prophecy at the invitation of the angel: "Come up hither, and I will show thee things to come." (Rev. 4:1.) Then shall we behold what is described in Tit. 2:13, 14; and in Is. 25:6–8; 1 Cor., ch. 15, and not as

"——tim'rous mortals start and shrink,
And fear to launch away,"

but boldly venture, and in most exalting and rapturous hope. (1 John 3:1–3; 4:17,18; Luke 21:28–31; Rev., ch. 21.)

David Hume jested about "Charon" and the passage accross the "River Styx," knowing the origin of the fable, and from whence Christians borrowed it! Why should Christian men give occasion for the ridicule of their "blessed hope" by substituting "fables" for the word of God? Says Dr. Dick:

"Infidel scoffers have been led to conclude that the Christian's heaven is no object to be desired; and have declared that they could feel no pleasure in being suspended forever in etherial regions and perpetually singing psalms to the Eternal. And it is incomprehensible also that a sensitive being should exist furnished with all the organs and functions requisite for animal life, and yet of a size ten thousand times less than a mite."

The ancient Egyptians believed, too, that the soul tarried with the body, or visited it, so long as the body remained entire; hence they sought the art of mummying the dead. They also built costly sepulchres, and covered the walls with pictures, paintings, and hieroglyphics, and even furnished the apartments as if for the living, designed to entertain the souls of the dead. To this most ancient custom, the Patriarch Job no doubt alluded, though far from entertaining the fabled notion: "For now should *I have lain still* and been quiet, I should have *slept;* then had *I been at rest,* with kings and counsellors of the earth, which *built desolate places* for *themselves.*" (ch. 3:13, 14.) The roaming of the souls of the dead without "quiet," "sleep," or "rest"—their wakefulness during the night of death—and their having enjoyment and entertainment in visiting the "desolate

places" of sepulture of the body after death, had no place in this Patriarch's faith: "Our rest together is in the dust." (ch. 16:13–16; and chs. 14 and 19.)

"Why do they wish for the hallowed-out rocks?
Or wherefore the beautiful monuments crave?
Unless 'tis believed that the body but slumbers,
And is not abandoned to death in the grave."

This conclusion of Prudentius is seen to be in a measure correct, so far as the Egyptians were concerned, from the following statement of Rev. Mr. Ellis:

"The Egyptians believed in the *immortality* of the *soul* and the *body.* This led them to the custom of mummying the dead, and the excavation of most costly sepulchres, adorned and beautified in every manner. They expected to return to their original bodies at some future time, and desired to find them not only perfect, but in such habitations as they might not be ashamed of. They expected to resume their bodies and inhabit the Nile valley. That this was their theology I think cannot be questioned."

The heathen world thus began with the doctrine of the immortality of both the soul and body, but finally abandoned the latter as entirely hopeless, inasmuch as not even the embalmed body ever was awakened by the spirit to life; but they retained still the doctrine of the soul's immortality as the only hope of future existence.

We must not overlook the fact, too, as we pass, that the Egyptians believed in the transmigration of souls; as did the Greeks after them, as taught by Plato, that they passed after death into both "human and brute forms." What a hope! Nothing consoling surely! All concerning the dead is dreary uncertain; but this is most repulsive! The thought of the spirit, or soul, in their judgment, entering into a cat, or dog, or crocodile, or serpent, or any other unclean or clean animal or reptile, could not afford, certainly, much consolation. How deplorable and wretched all hopes of this kind must have been respecting the dead! No wonder that in Egypt, even to this day, where the same idea is entertained concerning the departed, that there is so great lamentation over their dead!

Among the Greeks, Socrates was the great master and defender of the doctrine of the soul's immortality; but neither he nor his eminent disciple, Plato, ever were fully satisfied with their

UMI

This is because for the judgment is substituted death, which is ever an enemy (1 Cor. 15:26), even to the saints!

"Could we but climb where Moses stood,
And view the landscape o'er;
Not Jordan's waves, nor death's cold flood,
Should fright us from the shore."

We can, if we will ascend the mount of prophecy at the invitation of the angel: "Come up hither, and I will show thee things to come." (Rev. 4:1.) Then shall we behold what is described in Tit. 2:13, 14; and in Is. 25:6–8; 1 Cor., ch. 15, and not as

"——tim'rous mortals start and shrink,
And fear to launch away,"

but boldly venture, and in most exalting and rapturous hope. (1 John 3:1–3; 4:17,18; Luke 21:28–31; Rev., ch. 21.)

David Hume jested about "Charon" and the passage accross the "River Styx," knowing the origin of the fable, and from whence Christians borrowed it! Why should Christian men give occasion for the ridicule of their "blessed hope" by substituting "fables" for the word of God? Says Dr. Dick:

"Infidel scoffers have been led to conclude that the Christian's heaven is no object to be desired; and have declared that they could feel no pleasure in being suspended forever in etherial regions and perpetually singing psalms to the Eternal. And it is incomprehensible also that a sensitive being should exist furnished with all the organs and functions requisite for animal life, and yet of a size ten thousand times less than a mite."

The ancient Egyptians believed, too, that the soul tarried with the body, or visited it, so long as the body remained entire; hence they sought the art of mummying the dead. They also built costly sepulchres, and covered the walls with pictures, paintings, and hieroglyphics, and even furnished the apartments as if for the living, designed to entertain the souls of the dead. To this most ancient custom, the Patriarch Job no doubt alluded, though far from entertaining the fabled notion: "For now should *I have lain still* and been quiet, I should have *slept;* then had *I been at rest,* with kings and counsellors of the earth, which *built desolate places* for *themselves.*" (ch. 3:13, 14.) The roaming of the souls of the dead without "quiet," "sleep," or "rest"—their wakefulness during the night of death—and their having enjoyment and entertainment in visiting the "desolate

places" of sepulture of the body after death, had no place in this Patriarch's faith: "Our rest together is in the dust." (ch. 16:13–16; and chs. 14 and 19.)

"Why do they wish for the hallowed-out rocks?
Or wherefore the beautiful monuments crave?
Unless 'tis believed that the body but slumbers,
And is not abandoned to death in the grave."

This conclusion of Prudentius is seen to be in a measure correct, so far as the Egyptians were concerned, from the following statement of Rev. Mr. Ellis:

"The Egyptians believed in the *immortality* of the *soul* and the *body.* This led them to the custom of mummying the dead, and the excavation of most costly sepulchres, adorned and beautified in every manner. They expected to return to their original bodies at some future time, and desired to find them not only perfect, but in such habitations as they might not be ashamed of. They expected to resume their bodies and inhabit the Nile valley. That this was their theology I think cannot be questioned."

The heathen world thus began with the doctrine of the immortality of both the soul and body, but finally abandoned the latter as entirely hopeless, inasmuch as not even the embalmed body ever was awakened by the spirit to life; but they retained still the doctrine of the soul's immortality as the only hope of future existence.

We must not overlook the fact, too, as we pass, that the Egyptians believed in the transmigration of souls; as did the Greeks after them, as taught by Plato, that they passed after death into both "human and brute forms." What a hope! Nothing consoling surely! All concerning the dead is dreary uncertain; but this is most repulsive! The thought of the spirit, or soul, in their judgment, entering into a cat, or dog, or crocodile, or serpent, or any other unclean or clean animal or reptile, could not afford, certainly, much consolation. How deplorable and wretched all hopes of this kind must have been respecting the dead! No wonder that in Egypt, even to this day, where the same idea is entertained concerning the departed, that there is so great lamentation over their dead!

Among the Greeks, Socrates was the great master and defender of the doctrine of the soul's immortality; but neither he nor his eminent disciple, Plato, ever were fully satisfied with their

UMI

philosophy of a future life, or were supported with the certainty of their hope. Socrates says:

"The hazard of believing is noble, and it is right to *allure* ourselves with such things as with *enchantments*. Though I should be mistaken, I gain at least thus much, that the expectation makes me less uneasy while I live, and *my error will die with me*."

In his dying address to his judges, before drinking the fatal poison, he says:

"I go to death, you to life; but that which will be for the best the Divinity only knows."

Thus, at the best, the untenable doctrine of the soul's immortality, and its survivance after death, was uncertain, and could not afford any satisfactory hope, even to this its most eminent and ardent advocate in the hour of dissolution. Contrast this language of Socrates with that of the Patriarch Job, and see the confidence and faith and assurance and triumphant hope which support him in the hour of departure:

"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God; whom I myself shall behold, and not another: this my hope is laid up in my bosom." (Job 19:25–27, *Douay vers.*)

What confidence, what assurance, what satisfaction the Patriarch finds in the doctrine of the resurrection! While on the other hand, the testimony is incontrovertible that all hope founded on the immortality of the soul afforded no satisfactory, comforting, or confident expectation to any thoughtful mind.

THE CATACOMBS OF ROME, AND THE FAITH AND HOPE THEY REVEAL.

In the earlier inscriptions found in the catacombs of Rome, upon the tombs and burial places of the Christians, we find no intimations of the doctrine of the soul's immortality, or of rewards in death, or of any comforting hope drawn from the heathen conjecture. This famous labyrinth is thus described:

"The catacombs of Rome were excavations made at first for the purpose of obtaining building material for the city. As Rome stood on seven hills, it was an easy matter to open quarries in the hillsides, and here, undoubtedly, the work began.

The earth in that neighborhood abounds in loose, porous stone, called *tufa*, composed of volcanic cinders, or ashes, which, by the agency of water containing lime in solution, has formed a rock that is quite soft in its original bed, but hardens on being exposed to the air." (*Catacombs of Rome*, p. 38.)

The following few inscriptions, or epitaphs, selected from the many, will show the idea of the early Christians respecting the state of the dead, and their hope of a future awakening from the dead to eternal life of those who have "fallen asleep in Jesus:

PRIMITIUS, IN PEACE; AFTER MANY TORMENTS, A MOST VALIANT MARTYR.

The following two, it is stated, "were of a later date, but in the same spirit:"

PAULUS WAS PUT TO DEATH IN TORTURES, IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT LIVE IN ETERNAL BLISS.

CLEMENTIA, TORTURED, DEAD. SLEEPS: WILL RISE. (p. 87.)

"Here is one," says the author of the *Catacombs of Rome*, "which may serve as a fair specimen of a great number." He then gives a *fac simile* of the original in Latin. Translated, it is as follows:

LANUS, CHRIST'S MARTYR, RESTS HERE. HE SUFFERED UNDER DIOCLETIAN.

And here is one who suffered under the brief persecution under Julian:

HERE LIES GORDIANUS, DEPUTY OF GAUL, WHO WAS EXECUTED FOR THE FAITH WITH ALL HIS FAMILY: THEY REST IN PEACE.

Prof. Green, to whom I have before alluded, says, remarking upon the Lapidarian Gallery at Rome: "The Christian writes nothing upon his grave but the simple expression of his faith." And he gives the following examples, with others:

FLORENTI· IN PACE.
"Florentius in peace."

VALERIA· DORMIT IN PEACE.
"Valeria sleeps in peace."

UMI

philosophy of a future life, or were supported with the certainty of their hope. Socrates says:

"The hazard of believing is noble, and it is right to *allure* ourselves with such things as with *enchantments*. Though I should be mistaken, I gain at least thus much, that the expectation makes me less uneasy while I live, and *my error will die with me*."

In his dying address to his judges, before drinking the fatal poison, he says:

"I go to death, you to life; but that which will be for the best the Divinity only knows."

Thus, at the best, the untenable doctrine of the soul's immortality, and its survivance after death, was uncertain, and could not afford any satisfactory hope, even to this its most eminent and ardent advocate in the hour of dissolution. Contrast this language of Socrates with that of the Patriarch Job, and see the confidence and faith and assurance and triumphant hope which support him in the hour of departure:

"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God; whom I myself shall behold, and not another: this my hope is laid up in my bosom." (Job 19:25–27, *Douay vers.*)

What confidence, what assurance, what satisfaction the Patriarch finds in the doctrine of the resurrection! While on the other hand, the testimony is incontrovertible that all hope founded on the immortality of the soul afforded no satisfactory, comforting, or confident expectation to any thoughtful mind.

THE CATACOMBS OF ROME, AND THE FAITH AND HOPE THEY REVEAL.

In the earlier inscriptions found in the catacombs of Rome, upon the tombs and burial places of the Christians, we find no intimations of the doctrine of the soul's immortality, or of rewards in death, or of any comforting hope drawn from the heathen conjecture. This famous labyrinth is thus described:

"The catacombs of Rome were excavations made at first for the purpose of obtaining building material for the city. As Rome stood on seven hills, it was an easy matter to open quarries in the hillsides, and here, undoubtedly, the work began.

The earth in that neighborhood abounds in loose, porous stone, called *tufa*, composed of volcanic cinders, or ashes, which, by the agency of water containing lime in solution, has formed a rock that is quite soft in its original bed, but hardens on being exposed to the air." (*Catacombs of Rome*, p. 38.)

The following few inscriptions, or epitaphs, selected from the many, will show the idea of the early Christians respecting the state of the dead, and their hope of a future awakening from the dead to eternal life of those who have "fallen asleep in Jesus:

PRIMITIUS, IN PEACE; AFTER MANY TORMENTS, A MOST VALIANT MARTYR.

The following two, it is stated, "were of a later date, but in the same spirit:"

PAULUS WAS PUT TO DEATH IN TORTURES, IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT LIVE IN ETERNAL BLISS.

CLEMENTIA, TORTURED, DEAD. SLEEPS: WILL RISE. (p. 87.)

"Here is one," says the author of the *Catacombs of Rome*, "which may serve as a fair specimen of a great number." He then gives a *fac simile* of the original in Latin. Translated, it is as follows:

LANUS, CHRIST'S MARTYR, RESTS HERE. HE SUFFERED UNDER DIOCLETIAN.

And here is one who suffered under the brief persecution under Julian:

HERE LIES GORDIANUS, DEPUTY OF GAUL, WHO WAS EXECUTED FOR THE FAITH WITH ALL HIS FAMILY: THEY REST IN PEACE.

Prof. Green, to whom I have before alluded, says, remarking upon the Lapidarian Gallery at Rome: "The Christian writes nothing upon his grave but the simple expression of his faith." And he gives the following examples, with others:

FLORENTI· IN PACE.
"Florentius in peace."

VALERIA· DORMIT IN PEACE.
"Valeria sleeps in peace."

UMI

DORMITIO ELPIS.
"The sleeping-place of Elpis."

"Often the expression," he says, "is fuller and more distinct, referring this peaceful slumber to the Lord who gives it; as in the following form, which is found at the close of many inscriptions:

IN PACE DOMINI DORMIT.
"He sleeps in peace of the Lord."

"The resurrection of the body, the idea that, to a pagan, would have seemed still stranger than the more common assurance of peace, being held up as the end of this temporary slumber."

RELICTIS TUIS IACES IN PACE SOPORE MERITA RESURGIS TEMPORALIS TIBI DATA REQUIETIO.
"Thou well deserving one, having left thy (relations), lie in peace—in sleep. Thou wilt arise. A temporary rest is granted thee."

"Indeed," says our author, "it is to this belief in the resurrection of the body that we are indebted for the preservation of these precious remains. The Christian living in the midst of a hostile community, and often dying the most degrading or revolting death, would have frequently been tempted to cast aside, with comparative indifference, the mutilated remains of the friend whose spirit he knew to be far beyond the reach of human decay. [This, however, did not constitute the faith of the early Christians: else why is it not somewhere expressed upon their graves, as in after years of a corrupt theology under the apostasy?] But when he saw in them, all disfigured as they were, the substance which was to rise again refulgent with the immortality of Paradise, he gathered them together with a pious care, washed and anointed them, and filling the wounds with spices and precious ointments, laid them reverently in the sepulchre."

The author of the *Catacombs of Rome* gives us the significant meaning of the word "cemetery," with the following remarks:

"This, we have already said, means *a sleeping place.* The early Christians were the first to apply it to a place where their dead were buried; for they were the first who fully believed in a resurrection. As therefore they saw their friends lie down to sleep at night, in sweet assurance that they would rise again with the dawn, refreshed in both mind and body, so did they commit the bodies of their deceased friends to the tomb in as full and as

sweet an assurance that ere long they would awake again and rise in new power and beauty, and also immortal.

"What the rising sun was daily to a slumbering hemisphere, all that and even more would the coming of the glorious *Sun of righteousness* be to all his followers who had died upon the earth. How natural, then, that they should speak of death only as a soft, sweet sleep! And who can wonder that they should have covered their tombs as they did with these delightful intimations that their friends had only laid themselves down to rest awhile, and would in due time awake and rise to a better and happier life? How superior this to the poor consolations which the pagan Romans found in their thought of death! The doctrine of their life often was, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Let us enjoy all we can while we live, for death will soon put an end to all our joys! The better class of Pagan epitaphs breathe the language of despair, illustrating what the apostle Paul had in mind when he told his fellow-Christians at Thessalonica that *they* should not 'sorrow as others who have no hope.'" (p. 128, 129.)

Again the author says:

"In contrast with this fatalism, stoicism, and despair, how cheering the idea of the Christian's repose in death! Passing therefore from these pagan epitaphs to those which are Christian, is like emerging from the darkness of the catacombs into the sweet, bright light of day.

"A common Roman name for a grave was, 'My eternal home,' or dwelling of the dead, a name which could be retained no longer when the gospel had 'brought life and immortality to light.' Not satisfied with the Latin word *sepulchrum*, which meant only a place for burial, they employed most generally for the purpose one of the sweetest and most pleasant words which language afforded; and from that time till now, the place where Christ's beloved followers are buried is called a *cemetery*—or place *of* sleep." (p. 131, 132.)

"No heathen would ever have said or thought so sweet a thing of death as that it is only a peaceful sleep. (p. 207.)

Soon, however, the hope of the resurrection became obscured by that of another, and this became the expressed faith of the Apostasy, while the words IN PACE SOPORE and RESURGIS and RESURGAM were abandoned, as the false hope took the place of the real one. Here is an epitaph which the author of the *Catacombs of Rome* thinks "may have been composed somewhat later, and placed over the grave of one who was known to have suffered at the time alluded to, as, at this day, a new monument is frequently erected over the grave of a person who died fifty or a hundred years ago:"

UMI

DORMITIO ELPIS.
"The sleeping-place of Elpis."

"Often the expression," he says, "is fuller and more distinct, referring this peaceful slumber to the Lord who gives it; as in the following form, which is found at the close of many inscriptions:

IN PACE DOMINI DORMIT.
"He sleeps in peace of the Lord."

"The resurrection of the body, the idea that, to a pagan, would have seemed still stranger than the more common assurance of peace, being held up as the end of this temporary slumber."

RELICTIS TUIS IACES IN PACE SOPORE MERITA RESURGIS TEMPORALIS TIBI DATA REQUIETIO.
"Thou well deserving one, having left thy (relations), lie in peace—in sleep. Thou wilt arise. A temporary rest is granted thee."

"Indeed," says our author, "it is to this belief in the resurrection of the body that we are indebted for the preservation of these precious remains. The Christian living in the midst of a hostile community, and often dying the most degrading or revolting death, would have frequently been tempted to cast aside, with comparative indifference, the mutilated remains of the friend whose spirit he knew to be far beyond the reach of human decay. [This, however, did not constitute the faith of the early Christians: else why is it not somewhere expressed upon their graves, as in after years of a corrupt theology under the apostasy?] But when he saw in them, all disfigured as they were, the substance which was to rise again refulgent with the immortality of Paradise, he gathered them together with a pious care, washed and anointed them, and filling the wounds with spices and precious ointments, laid them reverently in the sepulchre."

The author of the *Catacombs of Rome* gives us the significant meaning of the word "cemetery," with the following remarks:

"This, we have already said, means *a sleeping place.* The early Christians were the first to apply it to a place where their dead were buried; for they were the first who fully believed in a resurrection. As therefore they saw their friends lie down to sleep at night, in sweet assurance that they would rise again with the dawn, refreshed in both mind and body, so did they commit the bodies of their deceased friends to the tomb in as full and as

sweet an assurance that ere long they would awake again and rise in new power and beauty, and also immortal.

"What the rising sun was daily to a slumbering hemisphere, all that and even more would the coming of the glorious *Sun of righteousness* be to all his followers who had died upon the earth. How natural, then, that they should speak of death only as a soft, sweet sleep! And who can wonder that they should have covered their tombs as they did with these delightful intimations that their friends had only laid themselves down to rest awhile, and would in due time awake and rise to a better and happier life? How superior this to the poor consolations which the pagan Romans found in their thought of death! The doctrine of their life often was, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Let us enjoy all we can while we live, for death will soon put an end to all our joys! The better class of Pagan epitaphs breathe the language of despair, illustrating what the apostle Paul had in mind when he told his fellow-Christians at Thessalonica that *they* should not 'sorrow as others who have no hope.'" (p. 128, 129.)

Again the author says:

"In contrast with this fatalism, stoicism, and despair, how cheering the idea of the Christian's repose in death! Passing therefore from these pagan epitaphs to those which are Christian, is like emerging from the darkness of the catacombs into the sweet, bright light of day.

"A common Roman name for a grave was, 'My eternal home,' or dwelling of the dead, a name which could be retained no longer when the gospel had 'brought life and immortality to light.' Not satisfied with the Latin word *sepulchrum*, which meant only a place for burial, they employed most generally for the purpose one of the sweetest and most pleasant words which language afforded; and from that time till now, the place where Christ's beloved followers are buried is called a *cemetery*—or place *of* sleep." (p. 131, 132.)

"No heathen would ever have said or thought so sweet a thing of death as that it is only a peaceful sleep. (p. 207.)

Soon, however, the hope of the resurrection became obscured by that of another, and this became the expressed faith of the Apostasy, while the words IN PACE SOPORE and RESURGIS and RESURGAM were abandoned, as the false hope took the place of the real one. Here is an epitaph which the author of the *Catacombs of Rome* thinks "may have been composed somewhat later, and placed over the grave of one who was known to have suffered at the time alluded to, as, at this day, a new monument is frequently erected over the grave of a person who died fifty or a hundred years ago:"

UMI

"In Christ. Alexander is not dead, but lives above the stars, and his body rests in this tomb. He ended his life under the Emperor Antonine, who, although he might have foreseen that great benefit would result from his services, rendered to him hatred instead of favor. For while on his knees, and about to sacrifice to the true God, he was led away to execution. O sad times! in which, among sacred rites and prayers, not even in caverns could we be safe. What can be more wretched than such a life? and what than such a death? where they cannot be buried by their friends and relations! At length they sparkle in heaven." (pp. 99, 100.)

What a manifest departure from the simplicity of the faith of the first Christians, as seen upon their graves in the inscriptions of their epitaphs. The terms *sleep* and *resurrection*, expressive of the condition in death, and the hope of the gospel, are both here abandoned, and another hope is substituted and made to appear, namely: "Alexander is not dead, but lives above the stars." He "sparkles in heaven."

This is a most flagrant departure from the primitive faith, language, and hope of the Christian Church in the beginning; and none can fail to see from whence comes the departure.

And others follow of a similar character, thus:

"In Christ. Aestonia, a traveling virgin, who lived forty-one years and eight days. She departed from the body on the fourth before the calends of March."

"Lawrence, to his sweetest son Severus, borne away by angels on the seventh ides of January."

These and like inscriptions are interspersed with those retaining the Scriptural faith and hope uncorrupted, as taught in the Scriptures and entertained by the early Christians. But here is another of like import, maintaining the error of rewards in death:

"Marcus, an innocent boy. You have already begun to be among the innocent ones. How enduring is such a life to you! How gladly will your Mother, the Church of God, receive you, returning to this world. Let us restrain our groans, and cease from weeping."

Believers in such a hope as is here expressed endeavor to comfort themselves and "restrain their groans, and cease from weeping," with the thought that their dead are "among the innocent ones;" and "in heaven, in the enjoyment of eternal life,"

and also the capability of spirit communication with this world, *i. e.*, the "Mother Church!" The origin of this hope is manifest. It is traced to the Church of Rome. This youth [boy], it is claimed, is not dead, but living. This reminds us of an anecdote of a person returning from the funeral of a child, who when asked by another, "Where have you been?" replied, "To bury a live child!" The interrogater asked an explanation, with astonishment, to which the person answered: "The *minister* said the child was not dead, but I thought it *was*."

In our modern cemeteries epitaphs abound declaring the dead to be "not dead, but living." And often this is expressed by the symbol of a hand and index finger pointing upward, with the significant meaning, with sometimes words to express the idea, that the sleeper has taken flight "beyond the stars," or "sparkles in heaven." Assuming, as in one instance observed by the writer, where this symbol is used, together with the language used by the angel over the open sepulchre of Jesus after his resurrection from the dead—"He is not here; for he is risen" (Matt. 28: 6)—that the departed was indeed risen from the dead as was Christ!

And we have seen the following over the graves of the dead:

> "'Tis but the casket that lies here:
> The gem that filled it sparkles yet,"

conveying the same false and fabled hope.

In all this character of inscriptions upon grave and monumental stones, the comforting and true hope of the gospel is entirely lost sight of, and that of the Papal Church substituted in its stead.

In the heathen world such false hope gives rise to all manner of speculations and superstitions respecting the condition of the dead. And so it does in more enlightened Christendom, where it is entertained.

In China, the superstition prevails that the spirits of the dead need to be provided for by the living, in order to be preserved, and carry on their varied employments in the spirit world. Tables are set and loaded with provisions to give them sustenance. Paper garments, and articles of manufacture, are made; and all manner of articles and instruments and utensils, for the carrying on of business and trades—together with gold and silver tissue paper, is prepared and provided, with which to furnish the spir-

UMI

"In Christ. Alexander is not dead, but lives above the stars, and his body rests in this tomb. He ended his life under the Emperor Antonine, who, although he might have foreseen that great benefit would result from his services, rendered to him hatred instead of favor. For while on his knees, and about to sacrifice to the true God, he was led away to execution. O sad times! in which, among sacred rites and prayers, not even in caverns could we be safe. What can be more wretched than such a life? and what than such a death? where they cannot be buried by their friends and relations! At length they sparkle in heaven." (pp. 99, 100.)

What a manifest departure from the simplicity of the faith of the first Christians, as seen upon their graves in the inscriptions of their epitaphs. The terms *sleep* and *resurrection*, expressive of the condition in death, and the hope of the gospel, are both here abandoned, and another hope is substituted and made to appear, namely: "Alexander is not dead, but lives above the stars." He "sparkles in heaven."

This is a most flagrant departure from the primitive faith, language, and hope of the Christian Church in the beginning; and none can fail to see from whence comes the departure.

And others follow of a similar character, thus:

"In Christ. Aestonia, a traveling virgin, who lived forty-one years and eight days. She departed from the body on the fourth before the calends of March."

"Lawrence, to his sweetest son Severus, borne away by angels on the seventh ides of January."

These and like inscriptions are interspersed with those retaining the Scriptural faith and hope uncorrupted, as taught in the Scriptures and entertained by the early Christians. But here is another of like import, maintaining the error of rewards in death:

"Marcus, an innocent boy. You have already begun to be among the innocent ones. How enduring is such a life to you! How gladly will your Mother, the Church of God, receive you, returning to this world. Let us restrain our groans, and cease from weeping."

Believers in such a hope as is here expressed endeavor to comfort themselves and "restrain their groans, and cease from weeping," with the thought that their dead are "among the innocent ones;" and "in heaven, in the enjoyment of eternal life,"

and also the capability of spirit communication with this world, *i. e.*, the "Mother Church!" The origin of this hope is manifest. It is traced to the Church of Rome. This youth [boy], it is claimed, is not dead, but living. This reminds us of an anecdote of a person returning from the funeral of a child, who when asked by another, "Where have you been?" replied, "To bury a live child!" The interrogater asked an explanation, with astonishment, to which the person answered: "The *minister* said the child was not dead, but I thought it *was*."

In our modern cemeteries epitaphs abound declaring the dead to be "not dead, but living." And often this is expressed by the symbol of a hand and index finger pointing upward, with the significant meaning, with sometimes words to express the idea, that the sleeper has taken flight "beyond the stars," or "sparkles in heaven." Assuming, as in one instance observed by the writer, where this symbol is used, together with the language used by the angel over the open sepulchre of Jesus after his resurrection from the dead—"He is not here; for he is risen" (Matt. 28: 6)—that the departed was indeed risen from the dead as was Christ!

And we have seen the following over the graves of the dead:

> "'Tis but the casket that lies here:
> The gem that filled it sparkles yet,"

conveying the same false and fabled hope.

In all this character of inscriptions upon grave and monumental stones, the comforting and true hope of the gospel is entirely lost sight of, and that of the Papal Church substituted in its stead.

In the heathen world such false hope gives rise to all manner of speculations and superstitions respecting the condition of the dead. And so it does in more enlightened Christendom, where it is entertained.

In China, the superstition prevails that the spirits of the dead need to be provided for by the living, in order to be preserved, and carry on their varied employments in the spirit world. Tables are set and loaded with provisions to give them sustenance. Paper garments, and articles of manufacture, are made; and all manner of articles and instruments and utensils, for the carrying on of business and trades—together with gold and silver tissue paper, is prepared and provided, with which to furnish the spir-

UMI

its money to carry on their business in the spirit world! And as the spirits are invisible, these articles must also be made invisible, which is done by burning them! Millions of money are thus expended to take care of the dead, under the superstitious notion that if they do not, these spirits of friends will turn demons and inflict upon them the most terrible calamities. The headless trunks, fallen in battle, must have heads stitched upon them with all speed, less the spirits appear headless in the spirit-world, and be dragged by demons to regions of terror, darkness, and insufferable torture!

Similar superstitions prevail among all barbarous nations and tribes. The American Indians fear to leave a fellow comrade in war upon the battle-field to be scalped, lest his spirit haunt them with terrible evil and judgments.

"In Lapland, when one approaches his dissolution, his friends are unwilling to attend him in his last moments. As soon as he expires, they quit the place with the utmost precipitation, apprehending some injury from his ghost, which they believe remains in his corpse, and delights in doing mischief to the living. They place an ax, with a tinder-box, by the side of the corpse of a man, and scissors and needles of a woman, so that they may take care of themselves in the spirit land.

"In Catholic countries, the masses are without end for the repose of the souls of their departed friends, or their deliverance from purgatory! However poor the relatives, they must deprive themselves of everything to accomplish this humane act.

"And in Russia, after the corpse is dressed, a priest is hired to pray for the soul, to purify it with incense, and sprinkle it with holy water while it remains above ground. When the body is carried to the grave, which is done with many gesticulations of sorrow, the priest produces a ticket signed by the Bishop and another clergyman as the deceased's passport to heaven. This being put into the coffin between the fingers of the corpse, the company return to the house of the deceased, where they drown their sorrow by intoxication, which lasts forty days! During that time a priest says prayers every day over the grave of the deceased. Though they do not believe in purgatory, yet they imagine that their departed friend may be assisted by prayer in his long journey to the place of his destination after this life." (Goldsmith.)

Thus is the doctrine of the soul's inherit immortality and survivance in death the foundation of all superstitions and errors and fables respecting an imaginary, conscious, intermediate state, or state of future life after death, among all peoples; affording in no

single instance satisfactory, sure, and comforting hope, as does the promise of the gospel—"the better resurrection."

How much more consistent, reasonable, and comforting the Scriptural idea respecting the condition in death, of a sweet, undisturbed sleep, repose, and rest; and how much more cheering and joyful the hope of the resurrection from the dead to the life everlasting, in the kingdom of God, than all these speculative and imaginary and fanciful faiths founded in heathenish ignorance and a corrupt and perverted theology of an apostate Christianity which has endeavored to put out the better hope.

Archbishop Whateley's remarks upon the intermediate state are just to the point here, and I cannot forego the pleasure of transcribing them in the close of my article:

"One objection to the reception of this supposition—an objection which affects the imagination, though not the understanding—is, that it seems as if there were a tedious and dreary interval of non-existence to be passed by such as should be supposed to sleep, perhaps for some thousands of years, which might elapse between their death and the end of the world. The imagination represents a wearisome length of time during which those that sleep in Christ would have to wait for his final coming to reward them. We fancy it hard that they should be lost to the world and to themselves—destitute of the enjoyments both of this life and of the next, and continuing for so many ages as if they never had been born. Such, I say, are the pictures which the imagination draws; but when we view things by the light of the understanding, they present a very different aspect. Reason tells us that a long and a short space of time are exactly the same to a person who is insensible. When any one looses his consciousness (as in the case of a fainting fit, or those recovered from drowning, suffocation, apoplexy, and the like), he not only does not perceive the length of the interval between the loss of his consciousness and the return of it, but there is (to him) no such interval; the moment at which he totally lost his sensibility seems (and is, to him), immediately succeeded by the moment in which he regains it. It is also illustrated by persons in sound sleep.... The moment of his awaking shall appear to him immediately to succeed that of falling asleep. And the contrast of passing a night of restlessness—how insufferably tedious a single night! how enormously long the interval between the times of the clock's striking! how we seem to feel as if the morning would never arrive. The long and dreary interval between death and the day of judgment (supposing the intermediate state to be a profound sleep) does not exist at all, except in the imagination. To the party concerned there is *no* interval whatever; but to

its money to carry on their business in the spirit world! And as the spirits are invisible, these articles must also be made invisible, which is done by burning them! Millions of money are thus expended to take care of the dead, under the superstitious notion that if they do not, these spirits of friends will turn demons and inflict upon them the most terrible calamities. The headless trunks, fallen in battle, must have heads stitched upon them with all speed, less the spirits appear headless in the spirit-world, and be dragged by demons to regions of terror, darkness, and insufferable torture!

Similar superstitions prevail among all barbarous nations and tribes. The American Indians fear to leave a fellow comrade in war upon the battle-field to be scalped, lest his spirit haunt them with terrible evil and judgments.

"In Lapland, when one approaches his dissolution, his friends are unwilling to attend him in his last moments. As soon as he expires, they quit the place with the utmost precipitation, apprehending some injury from his ghost, which they believe remains in his corpse, and delights in doing mischief to the living. They place an ax, with a tinder-box, by the side of the corpse of a man, and scissors and needles of a woman, so that they may take care of themselves in the spirit land.

"In Catholic countries, the masses are without end for the repose of the souls of their departed friends, or their deliverance from purgatory! However poor the relatives, they must deprive themselves of everything to accomplish this humane act.

"And in Russia, after the corpse is dressed, a priest is hired to pray for the soul, to purify it with incense, and sprinkle it with holy water while it remains above ground. When the body is carried to the grave, which is done with many gesticulations of sorrow, the priest produces a ticket signed by the Bishop and another clergyman as the deceased's passport to heaven. This being put into the coffin between the fingers of the corpse, the company return to the house of the deceased, where they drown their sorrow by intoxication, which lasts forty days! During that time a priest says prayers every day over the grave of the deceased. Though they do not believe in purgatory, yet they imagine that their departed friend may be assisted by prayer in his long journey to the place of his destination after this life." (Goldsmith.)

Thus is the doctrine of the soul's inherit immortality and survivance in death the foundation of all superstitions and errors and fables respecting an imaginary, conscious, intermediate state, or state of future life after death, among all peoples; affording in no

single instance satisfactory, sure, and comforting hope, as does the promise of the gospel—"the better resurrection."

How much more consistent, reasonable, and comforting the Scriptural idea respecting the condition in death, of a sweet, undisturbed sleep, repose, and rest; and how much more cheering and joyful the hope of the resurrection from the dead to the life everlasting, in the kingdom of God, than all these speculative and imaginary and fanciful faiths founded in heathenish ignorance and a corrupt and perverted theology of an apostate Christianity which has endeavored to put out the better hope.

Archbishop Whateley's remarks upon the intermediate state are just to the point here, and I cannot forego the pleasure of transcribing them in the close of my article:

"One objection to the reception of this supposition—an objection which affects the imagination, though not the understanding—is, that it seems as if there were a tedious and dreary interval of non-existence to be passed by such as should be supposed to sleep, perhaps for some thousands of years, which might elapse between their death and the end of the world. The imagination represents a wearisome length of time during which those that sleep in Christ would have to wait for his final coming to reward them. We fancy it hard that they should be lost to the world and to themselves—destitute of the enjoyments both of this life and of the next, and continuing for so many ages as if they never had been born. Such, I say, are the pictures which the imagination draws; but when we view things by the light of the understanding, they present a very different aspect. Reason tells us that a long and a short space of time are exactly the same to a person who is insensible. When any one looses his consciousness (as in the case of a fainting fit, or those recovered from drowning, suffocation, apoplexy, and the like), he not only does not perceive the length of the interval between the loss of his consciousness and the return of it, but there is (to him) no such interval; the moment at which he totally lost his sensibility seems (and is, to him), immediately succeeded by the moment in which he regains it. It is also illustrated by persons in sound sleep.... The moment of his awaking shall appear to him immediately to succeed that of falling asleep. And the contrast of passing a night of restlessness—how insufferably tedious a single night! how enormously long the interval between the times of the clock's striking! how we seem to feel as if the morning would never arrive. The long and dreary interval between death and the day of judgment (supposing the intermediate state to be a profound sleep) does not exist at all, except in the imagination. To the party concerned there is *no* interval whatever; but to

each person (according to this supposition) the moment of his closing his eyes in death will be instantly succeeded by the sound of the last trumpet which shall summon the dead; even though ages shall have intervened. (*Future State*, p. 80.)

"When the solemn trumpet soundeth o'er the couch of all the world;
And the curtain, thick of darkness, shall forever far be hurled;
What a morning then shall break o'er the opening eyes of earth;
What a rush of mighty terror then shall hush the sounds of mirth.

"When shall break that solemn morning o'er the nations wrapped in sleep;
Oh! that we may not be with them who will tremble then and weep;
May we hear the Master calling from the realms of cloudless light,
'Come hither, rested sleepers, Come, for there is no more night.'"

FIRST THINGS AND FIRST THOUGHTS ON AWAKING.

"As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." (Ps. 17:15.)

Paul tells us that "the hope of the resurrection" was not only that for which he, as a preacher of it, was persecuted, but that it was also the theme of all the prophets and of Moses. That is, the hope of the gospel was the hope of the law and of the prophecies: the hope is *one*. (As see Acts 26:6–8.) The resurrection, therefore, was not only "the hope of Israel," "to which all the twelve tribes....hope to come," "but the resurrection of the dead"—"of the just"—"the first"—and "the better resurrection" is THE hope of all scripturally intelligent believers. It is proper enough to say that our hope is in Christ, in his blood, his death, his resurrection, intercession, and all such things; but the culmination of all hope is in OUR PERSONAL RESURRECTION *from the dominion of death* by our Lord Jesus Christ, who is "the resurrection and the life," "at his appearing and kingdom," when "he shall judge the quick and the dead." So "when Christ our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." Christ's death and blood were the means of purchasing our release from death and its dominion, but it is the *actual resurrection of the person of each believer* that confers the release, and gives the longed-for deliverance—"the redemption of the body." This, therefore, is "the grace that shall be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

I propose in this article to draw some fair and natural inferences from these sweet words of David. The text is one of

most thrilling interest to every true, waiting, watching, praying, and hoping believer. We shall inquire, What will probably be the saints' experience as to first things and first thoughts on awaking in the resurrection? Saith David: "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

The great future is to us, while yet in this age, mysterious, notwithstanding the many intimations of it found in the Book of God. Yet, coming to a close and pious and reverent contemplation of it in connection with given stand-points and circumstances, many things of surpassing moment and interest suggest themselves to us, not only as highly probable, but from the nature of things, morally certain.

I. From all that we can gather out of the teachings of revelation, what can be more natural than that our very first thought on awaking will be the *fact* of it? Instant as a lightning flash will rush into the minds of the awaking saints the Scriptures which taught it, and led us to hope in it, and expect it. The full import and beauty of our baptism into Christ's death and in hope of resurrection will also now show itself with a significance and grandeur that none can at present realize, and when all who never were "baptized into Christ's death," and thus "planted together in the likeness of his resurrection," will certainly wish they had been. As each saint awakes and opens his eyes in the light of "endless life," it does seem to us impossible that any thought can have a precedence in any mind to this thought. It is a fact! a true, actual, personal resetting up; resurrection from the sleep of death! As he looks at this fact, sees it, feels it, realizes it in himself, and in myriads of others like himself all around him, having now "immortality, incorruption, power, and glory" stamped on every feature, limb, and action, his first thought is bound to be, "It is a fact, I am here, raised from the dead, a spiritual but literal person: I—me—my own very self again!" These reflections, however, will be, we suppose, but momentary. The immortal eye will be flooded with the brightest visions, and the mind with a world of the most transporting thoughts.

"Thoughts on thoughts a countless throng,
——chasing countless thoughts along!"

II. Next to that of the fact of our resurrection, we have no doubt will be the sight and thought of Jesus. A man just pick-

each person (according to this supposition) the moment of his closing his eyes in death will be instantly succeeded by the sound of the last trumpet which shall summon the dead; even though ages shall have intervened. (*Future State*, p. 80.)

"When the solemn trumpet soundeth o'er the couch of all the world;
And the curtain, thick of darkness, shall forever far be hurled;
What a morning then shall break o'er the opening eyes of earth;
What a rush of mighty terror then shall hush the sounds of mirth.

"When shall break that solemn morning o'er the nations wrapped in sleep;
Oh! that we may not be with them who will tremble then and weep;
May we hear the Master calling from the realms of cloudless light,
'Come hither, rested sleepers, Come, for there is no more night.'"

FIRST THINGS AND FIRST THOUGHTS ON AWAKING.

"As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." (Ps. 17:15.)

Paul tells us that "the hope of the resurrection" was not only that for which he, as a preacher of it, was persecuted, but that it was also the theme of all the prophets and of Moses. That is, the hope of the gospel was the hope of the law and of the prophecies: the hope is *one*. (As see Acts 26:6–8.) The resurrection, therefore, was not only "the hope of Israel," "to which all the twelve tribes....hope to come," "but the resurrection of the dead"—"of the just"—"the first"—and "the better resurrection" is THE hope of all scripturally intelligent believers. It is proper enough to say that our hope is in Christ, in his blood, his death, his resurrection, intercession, and all such things; but the culmination of all hope is in OUR PERSONAL RESURRECTION *from the dominion of death* by our Lord Jesus Christ, who is "the resurrection and the life," "at his appearing and kingdom," when "he shall judge the quick and the dead." So "when Christ our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." Christ's death and blood were the means of purchasing our release from death and its dominion, but it is the *actual resurrection of the person of each believer* that confers the release, and gives the longed-for deliverance—"the redemption of the body." This, therefore, is "the grace that shall be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

I propose in this article to draw some fair and natural inferences from these sweet words of David. The text is one of

most thrilling interest to every true, waiting, watching, praying, and hoping believer. We shall inquire, What will probably be the saints' experience as to first things and first thoughts on awaking in the resurrection? Saith David: "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

The great future is to us, while yet in this age, mysterious, notwithstanding the many intimations of it found in the Book of God. Yet, coming to a close and pious and reverent contemplation of it in connection with given stand-points and circumstances, many things of surpassing moment and interest suggest themselves to us, not only as highly probable, but from the nature of things, morally certain.

I. From all that we can gather out of the teachings of revelation, what can be more natural than that our very first thought on awaking will be the *fact* of it? Instant as a lightning flash will rush into the minds of the awaking saints the Scriptures which taught it, and led us to hope in it, and expect it. The full import and beauty of our baptism into Christ's death and in hope of resurrection will also now show itself with a significance and grandeur that none can at present realize, and when all who never were "baptized into Christ's death," and thus "planted together in the likeness of his resurrection," will certainly wish they had been. As each saint awakes and opens his eyes in the light of "endless life," it does seem to us impossible that any thought can have a precedence in any mind to this thought. It is a fact! a true, actual, personal resetting up; resurrection from the sleep of death! As he looks at this fact, sees it, feels it, realizes it in himself, and in myriads of others like himself all around him, having now "immortality, incorruption, power, and glory" stamped on every feature, limb, and action, his first thought is bound to be, "It is a fact, I am here, raised from the dead, a spiritual but literal person: I—me—my own very self again!" These reflections, however, will be, we suppose, but momentary. The immortal eye will be flooded with the brightest visions, and the mind with a world of the most transporting thoughts.

"Thoughts on thoughts a countless throng,
——chasing countless thoughts along!"

II. Next to that of the fact of our resurrection, we have no doubt will be the sight and thought of Jesus. A man just pick-

ed up from shipwreck would naturally and first of all realize and think of his salvation, but his second thought and inquiry would surely be about his savior. How even immortal minds will bear the first sight of Jesus, I cannot now conceive. They will all see him, and "see him as he is" at this moment in the "heaven of heavens" in "all his glory;" as he was, was also for forty days with his disciples after his resurrection until his ascension, which he occupied in speaking to them "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Also as he will be in the great day of awaking; "the same Jesus who was taken from them into heaven." I say, what will be the saint's first thoughts and feelings on *first seeing, with his own living eyes, his very living Redeemer in his kingdom and glory?* I cannot tell, and will not attempt to describe. Will our first thought be to fly to his feet like the holy Mary at his sepulcher, and seek to embrace him, and in that manner show him our gratitude and affection? It may be so: it seems natural, and accords perfectly with John's visions of these things in Rev. 5:8–10, who saw the twenty-four elders who "fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints [referring to this present age]; and they sang a new song, saying: Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth."

Oh! with what transport, pure, holy, ardent, intense, rapturous, will our first thoughts on seeing Jesus retrace all the past! Right before us, no veil, no cloud; a fact to our open vision stands the "Child born, the Son given, the wonderful Counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, Prince of peace." Oh! how lost in mortal ecstacy to look for the first time on him who turned the water into wine, was immersed in the Jordan, tempted forty days of the devil; the very agonizer in blood and sweat, the condemned of Pontius Pilate, the crucified between two notorious malefactors at the instigation of "his own" who "received him not;" the dead, the buried, resurrected ascended, and now returned Jesus; King of saints, Lord of glory, Monarch of worlds, principalities, powers; in all the glory of his Divine Father, his own glory, and that also of his holy angels. On his head the "many crows" of the universe, his great Father's own

hands having put the royal ensigns of universal government on his shoulders, with all the kingdoms of this world his own forever! Can you conceive what shall be our first thoughts and feelings on first seeing all this? I confess I cannot. My poor mind is yet too tiny, and my thoughts too mortal. I believe, however, that unworthy as I am, sinful as I am also as yet, a poor, imperfect worm at best, still, through his grace, I have a hope within me of soon realizing and actually seeing for myself all that my pen now writes of, and infinitely more than has yet ever entered into my heart. This rich, sweet hope of mine is the "glory of all my brightest days and the comfort of my nights of sorrow." It is all likewise of his grace; his sovereign favor. I merit nothing, deserve nothing: am only a sinful child of dust, redeemed with the precious blood of that Jesus of whom I speak, whom I love, in whom I do heartily believe, and in whom believing I rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, in the sweet hope that soon both I, and all mine, shall be with him and like him, serving him day and night in his temple forever.

III. I think the saints' next thought on awaking will, in all probability, be a thought of wonder and amazement at finding *themselves actually there.* Not implying any possibility of unfaithfulness in God to any of his promises, but only in review of our own past. Our sinful propensities, unbelieving hearts, and constant liability to deception; our indolence, worldliness, unequal tempers, foolish tongues, selfishness, covetousness, lovelessness, strife, trouble-making propensities, fretfulness under affliction, repinings for adversity, the little that we knew of God's word, or sought to know, the much that we accepted and depended upon which never had foundation in the truth of the gospel, the little that we prayed, or gave to the Lord, the little good that we did in the church, or the world, or ever sought to do; I say, in review of these things, it will at once astonish us that we are really saved and are there in "the first resurrection." How rapidly we shall recall to our minds all the previous facts of our personal history; our being all born in sin, living in sin so long without repentance, our natural hatred of holiness, disregard of God, despising of his commands, neglecting Christ, trifling with things of salvation! Oh! how we shall wonder that we are there! Shall we not *shout?* Every one of us trying to out-shout the others? Oh! yes, until our immortal voices ring and echo through all hights, and depths, and breadths, and

ed up from shipwreck would naturally and first of all realize and think of his salvation, but his second thought and inquiry would surely be about his savior. How even immortal minds will bear the first sight of Jesus, I cannot now conceive. They will all see him, and "see him as he is" at this moment in the "heaven of heavens" in "all his glory;" as he was, was also for forty days with his disciples after his resurrection until his ascension, which he occupied in speaking to them "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Also as he will be in the great day of awaking; "the same Jesus who was taken from them into heaven." I say, what will be the saint's first thoughts and feelings on *first seeing, with his own living eyes, his very living Redeemer in his kingdom and glory?* I cannot tell, and will not attempt to describe. Will our first thought be to fly to his feet like the holy Mary at his sepulcher, and seek to embrace him, and in that manner show him our gratitude and affection? It may be so: it seems natural, and accords perfectly with John's visions of these things in Rev. 5:8–10, who saw the twenty-four elders who "fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints [referring to this present age]; and they sang a new song, saying: Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth."

Oh! with what transport, pure, holy, ardent, intense, rapturous, will our first thoughts on seeing Jesus retrace all the past! Right before us, no veil, no cloud; a fact to our open vision stands the "Child born, the Son given, the wonderful Counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, Prince of peace." Oh! how lost in mortal ecstacy to look for the first time on him who turned the water into wine, was immersed in the Jordan, tempted forty days of the devil; the very agonizer in blood and sweat, the condemned of Pontius Pilate, the crucified between two notorious malefactors at the instigation of "his own" who "received him not;" the dead, the buried, resurrected ascended, and now returned Jesus; King of saints, Lord of glory, Monarch of worlds, principalities, powers; in all the glory of his Divine Father, his own glory, and that also of his holy angels. On his head the "many crows" of the universe, his great Father's own

hands having put the royal ensigns of universal government on his shoulders, with all the kingdoms of this world his own forever! Can you conceive what shall be our first thoughts and feelings on first seeing all this? I confess I cannot. My poor mind is yet too tiny, and my thoughts too mortal. I believe, however, that unworthy as I am, sinful as I am also as yet, a poor, imperfect worm at best, still, through his grace, I have a hope within me of soon realizing and actually seeing for myself all that my pen now writes of, and infinitely more than has yet ever entered into my heart. This rich, sweet hope of mine is the "glory of all my brightest days and the comfort of my nights of sorrow." It is all likewise of his grace; his sovereign favor. I merit nothing, deserve nothing: am only a sinful child of dust, redeemed with the precious blood of that Jesus of whom I speak, whom I love, in whom I do heartily believe, and in whom believing I rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, in the sweet hope that soon both I, and all mine, shall be with him and like him, serving him day and night in his temple forever.

III. I think the saints' next thought on awaking will, in all probability, be a thought of wonder and amazement at finding *themselves actually there.* Not implying any possibility of unfaithfulness in God to any of his promises, but only in review of our own past. Our sinful propensities, unbelieving hearts, and constant liability to deception; our indolence, worldliness, unequal tempers, foolish tongues, selfishness, covetousness, lovelessness, strife, trouble-making propensities, fretfulness under affliction, repinings for adversity, the little that we knew of God's word, or sought to know, the much that we accepted and depended upon which never had foundation in the truth of the gospel, the little that we prayed, or gave to the Lord, the little good that we did in the church, or the world, or ever sought to do; I say, in review of these things, it will at once astonish us that we are really saved and are there in "the first resurrection." How rapidly we shall recall to our minds all the previous facts of our personal history; our being all born in sin, living in sin so long without repentance, our natural hatred of holiness, disregard of God, despising of his commands, neglecting Christ, trifling with things of salvation! Oh! how we shall wonder that we are there! Shall we not *shout?* Every one of us trying to out-shout the others? Oh! yes, until our immortal voices ring and echo through all hights, and depths, and breadths, and

lengths of the New Jerusalem with, "Hallelujah to our own glorious Jesus forever!" Our being raised from the dead, being there our very own selves, and with our own eyes seeing Jesus as he is, all a blessed fact, it might seem,

IV. That our next thought would probably be like this: *Is this blessedness of glory to be ours forever?* Is it true that I am now immortal and incorruptible? That I shall sin no more forever? Get sick no more? Is it true that the joys of these first moments in heaven will all be abiding? Eternal? And while these thoughts may for an instant be revolving in our minds, a divine satisfaction will instantly put an end to every such thought with the yea and amen of God: "It *is* all forever!" But I must think that about this must be the time for us to look around on all the raised and glorified millions, and

V. To think of the loved ones. Notwithstanding there may be, and certainly will be many missing ones in that "first resurrection," because of their having died in their sins, yet there will be many loved ones there: not lost, but found; not dead, but alive; whom "we shall know even as also we are known." Blessed, holy, happy thought! This is bound also to be true. Adam in the garden of Eden was perfectly himself without any previous history, because he had none, being only just created; but we could not be ourselves if we had not each a personal history, because we shall be re-created, having been before. Were we to be simply made in the resurrection as Adam was in Eden, without any previous history, then it would not be a resurrection, or setting up again, but a creation, and we should not be our own selves, but simply creatures. As such we might be very happy, but if we could not identify ourselves, neither others, and know even as now known, then how could it be a resurrection—the bringing of us, our very selves back with Christ, which God promises? It must be "these vile bodies," and this "it" which is here "sown a natural body" must be the same "it" that is "raised in incorruption." Scripture, therefore, settles this point so interesting and important to us all, and entirely to our satisfaction. If our very selves in the resurrection, then we see readily the blessed provision which is necessarily in store for our fullest enjoyment of such hereafter as were dear to us here, but then dearer than ever. Thus Paul says that his converts at Thessalonica "will be the crown of his rejoicing in the day of Christ." Neither let us imagine any difficulty in finding loved

ones then because of the infinite multitudes around us, and the fatigue of wandering over such extended regions in search of them.

There will be nothing of this any more. We shall not travel then with labor and toil as we do now, because we shall not be dependent on the activity of arterial circulation, and the strength of muscle, and energy of morning freshness. We shall not be "born of the flesh" there, but "of the Spirit." This mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible incorruption, and that which was sown in weakness shall be raised in power, fashioned like unto Christ's own glorious body. We shall, in all probability, move with the act of volition. Christ says that we "shall be like unto the angels"—equal to the angels. How long was the angel Gabriel in coming to inform holy Daniel that the Lord had answered his prayer? It was but an instant—while the prophet was yet praying. (Dan. 9: 21.) I think it likely the mere volition will be the saints' motive power. How the angels fly I cannot tell. They do fly, and the saints shall be "equal to them"—shall be as the angels. We at once, therefore, get rid of all idea of labor and fatigue. It will be but to wish—but to will, and we are there. And, think you, will it not be the most delightful employment to be conceived thus to pass around the infinite hosts of the glorified, seeking out those we knew and loved, sojourned and toiled with in this vale of tears and sorrows; whom especially we loved because they loved Jesus? There is my godly father, my precious mother, my own companion, dearer than myself, and our sacredly-loved children; brothers, sisters, pastors, deacons, Sabbath-school teachers and pupils, neighbors and friends. Who can yet conceive the ecstacies of these first meetings and greetings in eternal day, and our first thoughts! The holy New Jerusalem, with all its blazing splendors of gold and precious stones, and pearls, and tree of life, beautiful river, and even its beautiful angels, will seem for a moment to be forgotten in the bliss of this final and eternal reunion of parents, and families, and friends, together now, all like our Lord, and with him forever.

It does seem to us that next to the joy of seeing our Jesus, will most certainly be that of seeing our own loved ones, now to be one and inseparable, each rejoicing in "the power of an endless life." Oh! how *last* thoughts will also comingle with these transporting *first* thoughts! The deaths which separated us on

lengths of the New Jerusalem with, "Hallelujah to our own glorious Jesus forever!" Our being raised from the dead, being there our very own selves, and with our own eyes seeing Jesus as he is, all a blessed fact, it might seem,

IV. That our next thought would probably be like this: *Is this blessedness of glory to be ours forever?* Is it true that I am now immortal and incorruptible? That I shall sin no more forever? Get sick no more? Is it true that the joys of these first moments in heaven will all be abiding? Eternal? And while these thoughts may for an instant be revolving in our minds, a divine satisfaction will instantly put an end to every such thought with the yea and amen of God: "It *is* all forever!" But I must think that about this must be the time for us to look around on all the raised and glorified millions, and

V. To think of the loved ones. Notwithstanding there may be, and certainly will be many missing ones in that "first resurrection," because of their having died in their sins, yet there will be many loved ones there: not lost, but found; not dead, but alive; whom "we shall know even as also we are known." Blessed, holy, happy thought! This is bound also to be true. Adam in the garden of Eden was perfectly himself without any previous history, because he had none, being only just created; but we could not be ourselves if we had not each a personal history, because we shall be re-created, having been before. Were we to be simply made in the resurrection as Adam was in Eden, without any previous history, then it would not be a resurrection, or setting up again, but a creation, and we should not be our own selves, but simply creatures. As such we might be very happy, but if we could not identify ourselves, neither others, and know even as now known, then how could it be a resurrection—the bringing of us, our very selves back with Christ, which God promises? It must be "these vile bodies," and this "it" which is here "sown a natural body" must be the same "it" that is "raised in incorruption." Scripture, therefore, settles this point so interesting and important to us all, and entirely to our satisfaction. If our very selves in the resurrection, then we see readily the blessed provision which is necessarily in store for our fullest enjoyment of such hereafter as were dear to us here, but then dearer than ever. Thus Paul says that his converts at Thessalonica "will be the crown of his rejoicing in the day of Christ." Neither let us imagine any difficulty in finding loved

ones then because of the infinite multitudes around us, and the fatigue of wandering over such extended regions in search of them.

There will be nothing of this any more. We shall not travel then with labor and toil as we do now, because we shall not be dependent on the activity of arterial circulation, and the strength of muscle, and energy of morning freshness. We shall not be "born of the flesh" there, but "of the Spirit." This mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible incorruption, and that which was sown in weakness shall be raised in power, fashioned like unto Christ's own glorious body. We shall, in all probability, move with the act of volition. Christ says that we "shall be like unto the angels"—equal to the angels. How long was the angel Gabriel in coming to inform holy Daniel that the Lord had answered his prayer? It was but an instant—while the prophet was yet praying. (Dan. 9: 21.) I think it likely the mere volition will be the saints' motive power. How the angels fly I cannot tell. They do fly, and the saints shall be "equal to them"—shall be as the angels. We at once, therefore, get rid of all idea of labor and fatigue. It will be but to wish—but to will, and we are there. And, think you, will it not be the most delightful employment to be conceived thus to pass around the infinite hosts of the glorified, seeking out those we knew and loved, sojourned and toiled with in this vale of tears and sorrows; whom especially we loved because they loved Jesus? There is my godly father, my precious mother, my own companion, dearer than myself, and our sacredly-loved children; brothers, sisters, pastors, deacons, Sabbath-school teachers and pupils, neighbors and friends. Who can yet conceive the ecstacies of these first meetings and greetings in eternal day, and our first thoughts! The holy New Jerusalem, with all its blazing splendors of gold and precious stones, and pearls, and tree of life, beautiful river, and even its beautiful angels, will seem for a moment to be forgotten in the bliss of this final and eternal reunion of parents, and families, and friends, together now, all like our Lord, and with him forever.

It does seem to us that next to the joy of seeing our Jesus, will most certainly be that of seeing our own loved ones, now to be one and inseparable, each rejoicing in "the power of an endless life." Oh! how *last* thoughts will also comingle with these transporting *first* thoughts! The deaths which separated us on

earth, the distress of hearts, and desolation of homes, which those separations brought to us who survived; and then again to those who survived us, and so on through untold generations. It will also be to us only as it were but last night. Though many ages may have passed since we died, yet they will be to us as nothing more than "a dream when one awaketh." We knew not anything after our death—"in that very day our thoughts perish." (Eccl. 9 : 5–10; Ps. 166 : 4.)

Our *last* thoughts in death will, therefore, be the very next ones preceding our *first* thoughts on awaking, in point of order, whilst in point of *time* there will be no time at all, because "the dead know not anything." Abel's last thought was, "Cain, my own brother, has smote and killed me. I die!" His next thought is, "I am alive! I am risen from the dead!"

Oh! what an eternity of bliss is before us! Think of the interest with which we shall listen to the recitals of worldly trials and deliverances, from such as Adam and Moses, Abraham and Job, Isaac, Jacob, and Jeremiah, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, witnesses of Jesus from all lands and ages, every moment feeling new power and transport in the thought that we ourselves and ours are now all again together and forever, with no dread of evil or thought of being separated again, through all the grand future eternity of God! Then, too, there will be the wondrous work of redemption and grace, and of our individual perseverance in spite of the evil human nature, Satan and sin, to all this final glory. Oh! what work for eternity to praise and magnify the love of God, the grace of Jesus, and the power of the Lord, the Spirit, by whose gracious work we were kept in spite of everything to all this bliss and glory. We shall begin with the story of the first Eden, the first temptation, the first sin, the first promise; and onward we shall pass to the days of Noah, Abraham, David, Jesus, the apostles, the abomination that made so great desolation in the earth—its supreme curse. Daniel will explain the image and beasts; John the vials, seals, trumpets, and plagues. Oh! how these holy men will thrill us with their details of God's doings and showings to them while on this earth, and of his faithfulness to us their children. We shall also, with Moses and Elijah, review the grand old Hebrew ritual in all its details and splendors of antiquity in type and promise. Thence also we shall go to Bethlehem, Gethsemane, Calvary, and the garden-sepulcher. Oh! how differently we

shall then see all these mysteries to what we do now or can, with the full blaze of eternity's light around us! What is now mystery, will then be simple; and what is now irreconcilable to us will then only create our astonishment that we ever stumbled, while every one's highest astonishment—even Abraham's, David's, Paul's, and John's—will be that they themselves are really there!

Then think, too, of the fact of our eternal intercourse, so free, full, and delightful, with all those great characters of early times—not the Alexanders, Cæsars, Wellingtons, and Napoleons, of sword, fire, and bloody memory—but those good and venerable saints of God, whom the mighty of this world knew not nor cared for, only to persecute and evil entreat them. With what delight shall we, who never did or suffered anything for Christ, in comparison with them, listen to the stories of their doings and sufferings! How we shall bend over the living lips of the father of the faithful telling about the offering up of his only Isaac as grandly typical of Jesus! Also of the distinguished patriarchs, while telling how they endured, through God's grace, such and such "cruel mockings and scourgings, bonds and imprisonments;" with apostles also, and millions of others who submitted for the sake of Jesus to every manner of indignity from this blind world, being devoured of wild beasts, and burned alive, and killed in divers ways and forms of cruelty, as witnesses of Jesus. Glorious host of noble martyrs! Sufferers once, but conquerors now! Oh! how the grand chorus will keep rolling round the vaulted universe as the falling waters of a mighty cataract—"Worthy is Jesus, hallelujah!"

The splendors of the heavenly state I dare not essay to meddle with. I have no thought, no powers of mind or imagination to conceive anything of it. Neither of the personal appearance of the Lord Jesus, the King on the throne of his glory, and the universal homage that shall then be done to him by all the powers and the principalities of the heavenly place. Nor can I begin to conceive the beauty and perfection and glory of everything of this (yet) sin-cursed and stricken, but (then) regenerated planet, as it will be, when "instead of the thorn it shall bring forth the fir tree, and instead of the briar the myrtle tree, which shall be to the Lord for a name, and for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." Oh! how strange our first thoughts there! While, as we look around from the earth's radii to its circum-

UMI

earth, the distress of hearts, and desolation of homes, which those separations brought to us who survived; and then again to those who survived us, and so on through untold generations. It will also be to us only as it were but last night. Though many ages may have passed since we died, yet they will be to us as nothing more than "a dream when one awaketh." We knew not anything after our death—"in that very day our thoughts perish." (Eccl. 9 : 5–10; Ps. 166 : 4.)

Our *last* thoughts in death will, therefore, be the very next ones preceding our *first* thoughts on awaking, in point of order, whilst in point of *time* there will be no time at all, because "the dead know not anything." Abel's last thought was, "Cain, my own brother, has smote and killed me. I die!" His next thought is, "I am alive! I am risen from the dead!"

Oh! what an eternity of bliss is before us! Think of the interest with which we shall listen to the recitals of worldly trials and deliverances, from such as Adam and Moses, Abraham and Job, Isaac, Jacob, and Jeremiah, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, witnesses of Jesus from all lands and ages, every moment feeling new power and transport in the thought that we ourselves and ours are now all again together and forever, with no dread of evil or thought of being separated again, through all the grand future eternity of God! Then, too, there will be the wondrous work of redemption and grace, and of our individual perseverance in spite of the evil human nature, Satan and sin, to all this final glory. Oh! what work for eternity to praise and magnify the love of God, the grace of Jesus, and the power of the Lord, the Spirit, by whose gracious work we were kept in spite of everything to all this bliss and glory. We shall begin with the story of the first Eden, the first temptation, the first sin, the first promise; and onward we shall pass to the days of Noah, Abraham, David, Jesus, the apostles, the abomination that made so great desolation in the earth—its supreme curse. Daniel will explain the image and beasts; John the vials, seals, trumpets, and plagues. Oh! how these holy men will thrill us with their details of God's doings and showings to them while on this earth, and of his faithfulness to us their children. We shall also, with Moses and Elijah, review the grand old Hebrew ritual in all its details and splendors of antiquity in type and promise. Thence also we shall go to Bethlehem, Gethsemane, Calvary, and the garden-sepulcher. Oh! how differently we

shall then see all these mysteries to what we do now or can, with the full blaze of eternity's light around us! What is now mystery, will then be simple; and what is now irreconcilable to us will then only create our astonishment that we ever stumbled, while every one's highest astonishment—even Abraham's, David's, Paul's, and John's—will be that they themselves are really there!

Then think, too, of the fact of our eternal intercourse, so free, full, and delightful, with all those great characters of early times—not the Alexanders, Cæsars, Wellingtons, and Napoleons, of sword, fire, and bloody memory—but those good and venerable saints of God, whom the mighty of this world knew not nor cared for, only to persecute and evil entreat them. With what delight shall we, who never did or suffered anything for Christ, in comparison with them, listen to the stories of their doings and sufferings! How we shall bend over the living lips of the father of the faithful telling about the offering up of his only Isaac as grandly typical of Jesus! Also of the distinguished patriarchs, while telling how they endured, through God's grace, such and such "cruel mockings and scourgings, bonds and imprisonments;" with apostles also, and millions of others who submitted for the sake of Jesus to every manner of indignity from this blind world, being devoured of wild beasts, and burned alive, and killed in divers ways and forms of cruelty, as witnesses of Jesus. Glorious host of noble martyrs! Sufferers once, but conquerors now! Oh! how the grand chorus will keep rolling round the vaulted universe as the falling waters of a mighty cataract—"Worthy is Jesus, hallelujah!"

The splendors of the heavenly state I dare not essay to meddle with. I have no thought, no powers of mind or imagination to conceive anything of it. Neither of the personal appearance of the Lord Jesus, the King on the throne of his glory, and the universal homage that shall then be done to him by all the powers and the principalities of the heavenly place. Nor can I begin to conceive the beauty and perfection and glory of everything of this (yet) sin-cursed and stricken, but (then) regenerated planet, as it will be, when "instead of the thorn it shall bring forth the fir tree, and instead of the briar the myrtle tree, which shall be to the Lord for a name, and for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." Oh! how strange our first thoughts there! While, as we look around from the earth's radii to its circum-

UMI

ference, we shall see not a sepulcher, nor a grave stone, nor an emblem of sorrow anywhere; no coffin, no hearse, no crape, nor mourners going about the streets. Neither shall we ever again listen to desolating tempests and howling oceans, the shrieks of shipwrecked multitudes, the terror-striking tramp of marching armies, the news of mighty navies, or contending nations making havoc and sporting in lust and blindness with the sorrows of a helpless race. No, God be thanked, none of these any more! Not another trace of this work of demons forever, nor a lone vestige of it shall ever again be seen; neither of the men or the nations who delighted in war, for the Lord shall have scattered them, and they who gloried in blood shall have received their recompense in both kind and measure. Instead of which things, all is now peace forever under the blessed reign of the "Prince of peace." Oceans now roll, and winds blow, and lambs and tigers gambol, oxen and wolves play and roar only in unison with the choral anthems of a redeemed and glory-filled earth. Satan is destroyed, his works abolished, and God is now as in Eden of old before Adam sinned, "All in all."

My fellow-pilgrims to the kingdom and glory of God, mighty joys await you! Lift up your heads, and be valiant to the end of the journey and conflict. It is but a little while and you are more than conquerors through the blood of the Lamb! Look, then, steadfastly at the things "not seen as yet." Think of them, long for and pray for them. *These are not "cunningly devised fables;" they are the great facts of revelation, "the faithful and true sayings of God."* Oh! hie thee onward, holy pilgrim! the hights of Zion are almost seen, the glory of God's house on the tops of the mountains begins to show itself in the mellow dawnings of time's foretold fullness. Oh! sleep not in this "City of Destruction;" spend not thy precious moments in accumulating perishing riches. Haste! oh! up and haste to the gleaming ensigns of the coming King of Israel! "Come, Lord Jesus; come quickly!"—*Anon.*

EVENING BY EVENING.

Good night, ye gems of beauty,
  Good night, thou gentle blue;
On quiet bed I lay me,
  And bid farewell to you.
Good night, ye wakeful woodlands,
  Good night, ye sleeping flowers,
Amid whose smiles and odors
  I've pass'd day's wayward hours.
Good night, ye star-tipped mountains,
  Old friends, the tried and true;
Good night, ye wandering waters;
  Ocean, good night to you.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

Good night, dear faces round me,
  Night's hours will swiftly run,
And we shall say, good morning,
  At the ascending sun.
The farewell hour is coming,
  The last good night is near,
When I shall part in silence,
  With those who loved me here.
Then, all my farewells over,
  Just passing out of sight,
Unweeping and untrembling,
  I'll *look* my last good night.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

Yet not good night forever;
  For he, who is my day,
Will wake me soon—I see him,
  Already on his way.
No, not good night forever;
  I shall but sleep in him
Who shall arouse me early
  While yet the dawn is dim,
Who shall arouse me early,
  And bid this flesh arise,
In glorious resurrection,
  To meet him in the skies.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

I see him—lo, he cometh—
  Himself the morning light,
To bring the dawn of gladness,
  The dawn that knows no night.
O Bridegroom of the morning!
  Bright bringer of the day,
Put on thy fair adorning,
  Thy beautiful array.
Lord Jesus, star of evening,
  Yet star of morning too;
Earth's new created splendor
  Rise on our longing view.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.—*Bonar.*

UMI

ference, we shall see not a sepulcher, nor a grave stone, nor an emblem of sorrow anywhere; no coffin, no hearse, no crape, nor mourners going about the streets. Neither shall we ever again listen to desolating tempests and howling oceans, the shrieks of shipwrecked multitudes, the terror-striking tramp of marching armies, the news of mighty navies, or contending nations making havoc and sporting in lust and blindness with the sorrows of a helpless race. No, God be thanked, none of these any more! Not another trace of this work of demons forever, nor a lone vestige of it shall ever again be seen; neither of the men or the nations who delighted in war, for the Lord shall have scattered them, and they who gloried in blood shall have received their recompense in both kind and measure. Instead of which things, all is now peace forever under the blessed reign of the "Prince of peace." Oceans now roll, and winds blow, and lambs and tigers gambol, oxen and wolves play and roar only in unison with the choral anthems of a redeemed and glory-filled earth. Satan is destroyed, his works abolished, and God is now as in Eden of old before Adam sinned, "All in all."

My fellow-pilgrims to the kingdom and glory of God, mighty joys await you! Lift up your heads, and be valiant to the end of the journey and conflict. It is but a little while and you are more than conquerors through the blood of the Lamb! Look, then, steadfastly at the things "not seen as yet." Think of them, long for and pray for them. *These are not "cunningly devised fables;" they are the great facts of revelation, "the faithful and true sayings of God."* Oh! hie thee onward, holy pilgrim! the hights of Zion are almost seen, the glory of God's house on the tops of the mountains begins to show itself in the mellow dawnings of time's foretold fullness. Oh! sleep not in this "City of Destruction;" spend not thy precious moments in accumulating perishing riches. Haste! oh! up and haste to the gleaming ensigns of the coming King of Israel! "Come, Lord Jesus; come quickly!"—*Anon.*

EVENING BY EVENING.

Good night, ye gems of beauty,
  Good night, thou gentle blue;
On quiet bed I lay me,
  And bid farewell to you.
Good night, ye wakeful woodlands,
  Good night, ye sleeping flowers,
Amid whose smiles and odors
  I've pass'd day's wayward hours.
Good night, ye star-tipped mountains,
  Old friends, the tried and true;
Good night, ye wandering waters;
  Ocean, good night to you.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

Good night, dear faces round me,
  Night's hours will swiftly run,
And we shall say, good morning,
  At the ascending sun.
The farewell hour is coming,
  The last good night is near,
When I shall part in silence,
  With those who loved me here.
Then, all my farewells over,
  Just passing out of sight,
Unweeping and untrembling,
  I'll *look* my last good night.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

Yet not good night forever;
  For he, who is my day,
Will wake me soon—I see him,
  Already on his way.
No, not good night forever;
  I shall but sleep in him
Who shall arouse me early
  While yet the dawn is dim,
Who shall arouse me early,
  And bid this flesh arise,
In glorious resurrection,
  To meet him in the skies.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

I see him—lo, he cometh—
  Himself the morning light,
To bring the dawn of gladness,
  The dawn that knows no night.
O Bridegroom of the morning!
  Bright bringer of the day,
Put on thy fair adorning,
  Thy beautiful array.
Lord Jesus, star of evening,
  Yet star of morning too;
Earth's new created splendor
  Rise on our longing view.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.—*Bonar.*

UMI

THE TRINITY.

By Eld. E. Royce, Altona, Ill.

"They have erred from the faith."—*Paul.*

Among the various items of faith which when embodied constitute the creed of what is termed 'orthodoxy,' none holds a more conspicuous place than the one named at the head of this article, embracing in its theory under the appellation of the Triune God, a plurality of gods, three distinct persons, yet one in substance, equal in power and glory. This dogma is intimately and perhaps inseparably connected with the doctrine of the innate immortality of man, and peculiar sanctity is attached to it in this connection, as an essential element of the true faith, which cannot be ignored by any person deserving the name of Christian. This being the case, it becomes a matter of importance to the truth-seeker whether this claim is well founded; whether this doctrine was taught by Jesus and the Apostles, or whether it was introduced into the church from another source, at a later day, and elaborated by sectarian machinery for party purposes. In order therefore to arrive at a correct conclusion concerning this matter, and believing Paul's rule—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good"—to be a safe one to follow, we will submit to the test of truth as revealed in the Bible concerning the former point, and the record found in reliable church history concerning the latter, willing to abide the result, and hoping the candid reader will be ready to do the same.

In submitting this doctrine to the test of the Scriptures, the only true source for light on what we must believe in order to be saved, we find one important truth revealed, which if sufficient of itself to substantiate the prevalent view, would settle the question forever: I mean the pre-existence of Christ. This is emphatically declared, as recorded in John 16: 28; 8: 58, and by implication in several other places. But while this is true, there are also two other facts in the same connection which materially modify the force of the argument in that direction, namely: (1) He never gave the apostles the slightest intimation whatever of any act or agency performed by him during that period of time; and (2) he never claimed an equality with the

Father in the sense suggested by this doctrine, but (see John 17, &c.) distinctly asserted his entire subordination. So while the apostles evidently believed in his pre-existence as a matter of faith, they also believed the particulars concerning it were a secret with the Father, who (Luke 10: 22) *only knew who he was.* Consequently they did not agitate the question, or make it an essential part of their teaching. "Great is the mystery of godliness *which*[1] was manifest in the flesh," said Paul to Timothy; but he did *not* tell him that manifestation was the second person in the Trinity.[2]

On the other hand, the apostles believed Jesus to be what he declared himself to be—the *Son* of God; and dwelt fundamentally on the necessity of believing on him as their Savior, King, and future Life-giver, who died, was buried, rose again, ascended to heaven, was then seated at the Father's right hand, and would *personally* come again at the end of the age and give eternal life to his waiting people; exhorting them to purify their souls by obeying the truth, and thus prepare for that important event. This in substance was their teaching to the people both Jews and Gentiles, at all times and in all places, and there is no evidence that this doctrine, which has since become so important, formed any part of the faith of primitive Christianity.

The question, then, is naturally suggested, From whence did this dogma arise; and how came it to gain the important place it now holds in the creed of professed Christendom? In reply to the first part of this question I remark negatively, that the doctrine of a Triune God, whether true or false, did not originate from the teachings of Jesus or the apostles; for like some other theories which have been incorporated into the faith of popular Christendom, it lies at the base of the mythologies of the more civilized ancient heathen nations. For example, concerning the Hindoo mythology.[3] They believe in one God, *Brahm*, a self-existing, incomprehensible Spirit, whose three essential attributes are personified and worshiped under the respective names of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The ancient Egyptians[4] also worshiped the deified attributes of their gods in *triads.* A representation of a triune god is also found among

[1] I substitute the word *which* (or who) in place of *God* in this quotation, because it so reads in the most ancient manuscripts.
[2] The word *trinity* was first used in the church sometime in the second century. (Ruter.)
[3] Moore. *Hindu Pantheon*, p. 242.
[4] Wilkinson. *Ancient Egypt*, 2d Series, vol. 1, pp. 185, 281.

UMI

THE TRINITY.

By Eld. E. Royce, Altona, Ill.

"They have erred from the faith."—*Paul.*

Among the various items of faith which when embodied constitute the creed of what is termed 'orthodoxy,' none holds a more conspicuous place than the one named at the head of this article, embracing in its theory under the appellation of the Triune God, a plurality of gods, three distinct persons, yet one in substance, equal in power and glory. This dogma is intimately and perhaps inseparably connected with the doctrine of the innate immortality of man, and peculiar sanctity is attached to it in this connection, as an essential element of the true faith, which cannot be ignored by any person deserving the name of Christian. This being the case, it becomes a matter of importance to the truth-seeker whether this claim is well founded; whether this doctrine was taught by Jesus and the Apostles, or whether it was introduced into the church from another source, at a later day, and elaborated by sectarian machinery for party purposes. In order therefore to arrive at a correct conclusion concerning this matter, and believing Paul's rule—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good"—to be a safe one to follow, we will submit to the test of truth as revealed in the Bible concerning the former point, and the record found in reliable church history concerning the latter, willing to abide the result, and hoping the candid reader will be ready to do the same.

In submitting this doctrine to the test of the Scriptures, the only true source for light on what we must believe in order to be saved, we find one important truth revealed, which if sufficient of itself to substantiate the prevalent view, would settle the question forever: I mean the pre-existence of Christ. This is emphatically declared, as recorded in John 16: 28; 8: 58, and by implication in several other places. But while this is true, there are also two other facts in the same connection which materially modify the force of the argument in that direction, namely: (1) He never gave the apostles the slightest intimation whatever of any act or agency performed by him during that period of time; and (2) he never claimed an equality with the

Father in the sense suggested by this doctrine, but (see John 17, &c.) distinctly asserted his entire subordination. So while the apostles evidently believed in his pre-existence as a matter of faith, they also believed the particulars concerning it were a secret with the Father, who (Luke 10: 22) *only knew who he was.* Consequently they did not agitate the question, or make it an essential part of their teaching. "Great is the mystery of godliness *which*[1] was manifest in the flesh," said Paul to Timothy; but he did *not* tell him that manifestation was the second person in the Trinity.[2]

On the other hand, the apostles believed Jesus to be what he declared himself to be—the *Son* of God; and dwelt fundamentally on the necessity of believing on him as their Savior, King, and future Life-giver, who died, was buried, rose again, ascended to heaven, was then seated at the Father's right hand, and would *personally* come again at the end of the age and give eternal life to his waiting people; exhorting them to purify their souls by obeying the truth, and thus prepare for that important event. This in substance was their teaching to the people both Jews and Gentiles, at all times and in all places, and there is no evidence that this doctrine, which has since become so important, formed any part of the faith of primitive Christianity.

The question, then, is naturally suggested, From whence did this dogma arise; and how came it to gain the important place it now holds in the creed of professed Christendom? In reply to the first part of this question I remark negatively, that the doctrine of a Triune God, whether true or false, did not originate from the teachings of Jesus or the apostles; for like some other theories which have been incorporated into the faith of popular Christendom, it lies at the base of the mythologies of the more civilized ancient heathen nations. For example, concerning the Hindoo mythology.[3] They believe in one God, *Brahm*, a self-existing, incomprehensible Spirit, whose three essential attributes are personified and worshiped under the respective names of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The ancient Egyptians[4] also worshiped the deified attributes of their gods in *triads.* A representation of a triune god is also found among

[1] I substitute the word *which* (or who) in place of *God* in this quotation, because it so reads in the most ancient manuscripts.
[2] The word *trinity* was first used in the church sometime in the second century. (Ruter.)
[3] Moore. *Hindu Pantheon*, p. 242.
[4] Wilkinson. *Ancient Egypt*, 2d Series, vol. 1, pp. 185, 281.

UMI

the antiquities of Assyria.[1] A trinity can also be traced through all Chinese philosophy and religion.[2] Says DuHalde:[3] "The substance of Fo is *one, but he has three forms.*" Again the "Orphic Trinity" according to Cory[4] was a *triad* subordinate to a *monad.* The Greek philosophers Pythagoras, Parmenides, and Plato also recognized the same doctrine.[5] We thus learn it was not dependent upon a revelation from God for its origin.

To answer this question affirmatively, to show how the transition was effected from Christianity as it was in the Apostolic age to Christianity as we find it in the age of the Fathers; from Christianity as taught by Jesus and the Apostles to Christianity as we find it taught in the fourth and fifth centuries, and, to a great extent, in the popular church ever since, and thus show the rise of this doctrine, is perhaps in some respects a more difficult task. For in the words of the Rev. Dr. Stanley of the Church of England:[6] "No other change equally momentous has ever since affected its fortunes [Christianity], yet none has ever been so silent and secret. The stream in that most critical moment of its passage from the everlasting hills to the plain below is lost to our view at the very point where we are most anxious to watch it. It is not so much a period for ecclesiastical history as for ecclesiastical controversy and conjecture." The change truly was great, and history is somewhat meager concerning it: nevertheless we will endeavor to gather the substantial facts as far as practicable.

In the first place the divisions which had been fermenting during the Apostolic day through the influence of false teachers, (as often referred to in their writings[7]), after the Apostles had passed away increased in volume, and caused the church to be divided and subdivided into a great variety of sects. These were greatly multiplied by the Gnostics,[8] in abstruse philosophic discussions concerning the deductive meaning of words and phrases found in the Gospels and Epistles. They were not satisfied with what was revealed concerning the pre-existence of Christ,[1] but claimed to be able to understand by their superior knowledge certain things concerning it and his inherent nature; which, if true, are not revealed in the Scriptures. "It is no wonder," says Tertullian,[2] "if the ingenuity of philosophers perverted the Old Testament, since men sprung from them have corrupted even the New Testament by their opinions, so as to support the tenets of their philosophy." These philosophical speculations, aided by similar ones borrowed from Greek philosophy[3] and introduced by converts from heathen nations infected by it, engendered the primary elements of this doctrine in the church. On this point Knapp remarks:[4] "They found in the New Testament some expressions (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) which apparently resembled their previous philosophy. ....It was therefore easy to annex their former philosophic notions to the language of Scripture." Mosheim[5] also says in reference to the same point: "Whatever is to be met in Scripture respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was expounded by these Christians [*i. e.*, the Alexandrian school] so as to render it consistent with the doctrine of *three hypostases* or natures in God, *as maintained by Plato, Parmenides, and others.*" And thus from Greek philosophy and the abstruse speculations of the Gnostics were gathered the elementary principles of this doctrine which is now held sacred as a part of the revealed Word, by modern orthodoxy.

But at this point of time the idea was comparatively in an embryo state; for while it had many nominal adherents, they were afloat on a sea of conjecture, as well they might be, without a "Thus saith the Lord" for a pilot; consequently, some rejected it altogether, and held the opposite view, that Christ was but a mere man, which at that time was not considered inconsistent with Christianity.[6] Irenæus (A. D. 157)[7] expresses his views upon the question as follows: "If then any one says to us, After what manner is the Son derived from the Father? we say to him

[1] Layard. *Second Expedition*, p. 160.
[2] Williams. *Middle Kingdom*, vol. 2, p. 197.
[3] *China Glossary*, vol. 1.
[4] *Ancient Fragments*, pp. 354, 355.
[5] Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, ch. 4, s. 36.
[6] *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, p. 36.
[7] Rom. 16: 17, 18; 1 Cor. 1: 10, 11; 3: 3, 4; 15: 12; 2 Cor. 2; 17; Gal. 1: 6, 7; Phil. 1: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 5, 7, 19, &c., &c.
[8] They believed that man was composed of a soul which is of *celestial* origin, and which would aspire to worship the true God were it not that the other half of his nature, which is a corrupt body, supercedes all its more virtuous desires, and attaches it to its pursuits of sensuality. (Ruter, p. 16.)

[1] From the imperfections of the Jewish dispensation the Gnostics (wise or knowing) hastily inferred that it was not instituted by the Supreme Being: and assuming that pompous appellation, boasted their ability to restore to mankind that knowledge of his [Christ's] nature which had so long been lost. (Ruter, p. 29.)
[2] *Apology*, ch. 47.
[3] This philosophy, which involved the truth of the Gospel in subtlety and obscurity, and *added to the doctrine of Christ the commandments of men*, became in time extremely prejudicial to the Christian cause. (Ruter, p. 36.)
[4] *Theology*, p. 179.
[5] *Comm. Affairs of Christ. before Const.*, ch. 2, p. 159—Note.
[6] Hasse. *History Christian Church*, p. 98.
[7] *Whiston's Works*, vol. 4, p. 157.

UMI

the antiquities of Assyria.[1] A trinity can also be traced through all Chinese philosophy and religion.[2] Says DuHalde:[3] "The substance of Fo is *one, but he has three forms.*" Again the "Orphic Trinity" according to Cory[4] was a *triad* subordinate to a *monad.* The Greek philosophers Pythagoras, Parmenides, and Plato also recognized the same doctrine.[5] We thus learn it was not dependent upon a revelation from God for its origin.

To answer this question affirmatively, to show how the transition was effected from Christianity as it was in the Apostolic age to Christianity as we find it in the age of the Fathers; from Christianity as taught by Jesus and the Apostles to Christianity as we find it taught in the fourth and fifth centuries, and, to a great extent, in the popular church ever since, and thus show the rise of this doctrine, is perhaps in some respects a more difficult task. For in the words of the Rev. Dr. Stanley of the Church of England:[6] "No other change equally momentous has ever since affected its fortunes [Christianity], yet none has ever been so silent and secret. The stream in that most critical moment of its passage from the everlasting hills to the plain below is lost to our view at the very point where we are most anxious to watch it. It is not so much a period for ecclesiastical history as for ecclesiastical controversy and conjecture." The change truly was great, and history is somewhat meager concerning it: nevertheless we will endeavor to gather the substantial facts as far as practicable.

In the first place the divisions which had been fermenting during the Apostolic day through the influence of false teachers, (as often referred to in their writings[7]), after the Apostles had passed away increased in volume, and caused the church to be divided and subdivided into a great variety of sects. These were greatly multiplied by the Gnostics,[8] in abstruse philosophic discussions concerning the deductive meaning of words and phrases found in the Gospels and Epistles. They were not satisfied with what was revealed concerning the pre-existence of Christ,[1] but claimed to be able to understand by their superior knowledge certain things concerning it and his inherent nature; which, if true, are not revealed in the Scriptures. "It is no wonder," says Tertullian,[2] "if the ingenuity of philosophers perverted the Old Testament, since men sprung from them have corrupted even the New Testament by their opinions, so as to support the tenets of their philosophy." These philosophical speculations, aided by similar ones borrowed from Greek philosophy[3] and introduced by converts from heathen nations infected by it, engendered the primary elements of this doctrine in the church. On this point Knapp remarks:[4] "They found in the New Testament some expressions (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) which apparently resembled their previous philosophy. ....It was therefore easy to annex their former philosophic notions to the language of Scripture." Mosheim[5] also says in reference to the same point: "Whatever is to be met in Scripture respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was expounded by these Christians [*i. e.*, the Alexandrian school] so as to render it consistent with the doctrine of *three hypostases* or natures in God, *as maintained by Plato, Parmenides, and others.*" And thus from Greek philosophy and the abstruse speculations of the Gnostics were gathered the elementary principles of this doctrine which is now held sacred as a part of the revealed Word, by modern orthodoxy.

But at this point of time the idea was comparatively in an embryo state; for while it had many nominal adherents, they were afloat on a sea of conjecture, as well they might be, without a "Thus saith the Lord" for a pilot; consequently, some rejected it altogether, and held the opposite view, that Christ was but a mere man, which at that time was not considered inconsistent with Christianity.[6] Irenæus (A. D. 157)[7] expresses his views upon the question as follows: "If then any one says to us, After what manner is the Son derived from the Father? we say to him

[1] Layard. *Second Expedition*, p. 160.
[2] Williams. *Middle Kingdom*, vol. 2, p. 197.
[3] *China Glossary*, vol. 1.
[4] *Ancient Fragments*, pp. 354, 355.
[5] Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, ch. 4, s. 36.
[6] *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, p. 36.
[7] Rom. 16: 17, 18; 1 Cor. 1: 10, 11; 3: 3, 4; 15: 12; 2 Cor. 2; 17; Gal. 1: 6, 7; Phil. 1: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 5, 7, 19, &c., &c.
[8] They believed that man was composed of a soul which is of *celestial* origin, and which would aspire to worship the true God were it not that the other half of his nature, which is a corrupt body, supercedes all its more virtuous desires, and attaches it to its pursuits of sensuality. (Ruter, p. 16.)

[1] From the imperfections of the Jewish dispensation the Gnostics (wise or knowing) hastily inferred that it was not instituted by the Supreme Being: and assuming that pompous appellation, boasted their ability to restore to mankind that knowledge of his [Christ's] nature which had so long been lost. (Ruter, p. 29.)
[2] *Apology*, ch. 47.
[3] This philosophy, which involved the truth of the Gospel in subtlety and obscurity, and *added to the doctrine of Christ the commandments of men*, became in time extremely prejudicial to the Christian cause. (Ruter, p. 36.)
[4] *Theology*, p. 179.
[5] *Comm. Affairs of Christ. before Const.*, ch. 2, p. 159—Note.
[6] Hasse. *History Christian Church*, p. 98.
[7] *Whiston's Works*, vol. 4, p. 157.

UMI

that no one knows the probation or generation, or nuncupation, or aduperation, or whatever name any one pleases to call this generation which is ineffable. Not Valentinus, nor Marcion,[1] nor Basilides, nor angels, nor arch-angels, nor principalities, nor powers; but only the Father who begat, and the Son who was begotten." Notwithstanding the opposition, however, the doctrine that Jesus was the incarnate *logos*[2] (a Greek term for the divine will or energy, borrowed from Platonic philosophy), whose existence they held was co-eval with the Father, became prevalent in the church as early as the close of the third century.

About this time the world became excited by the promulgation of a new theory by Arius, of whom Ruter[3] writes as follows: "The Trinitarian controversy was a deluge which overflowed the whole Christian world. Arius, a presbyter of the church of Alexandria, acute, eloquent, and subtle, contended in opposition to his bishop, Alexander, in an assembly of presbyters, that the Son was essentially distinct from the Father: that he was a dependent, spontaneous production, created by the will of the Father out of nothing; that he had been begotten before all worlds; but that there had been a time when he was not; that the Father had impressed upon him the effulgence of his glory; and transfused into him his ample Spirit; that he was the framer of the world and governor of the universe in obedience to the will of his Father and Monarch." This theory, so contrary to the prevailing opinion that he had existed as the *logos* from the beginning, was bitterly opposed by many, while others warmly sustained it. Thus arose the noted Arian controversy, which so distracted the church that Constantine (A. D. 323) summoned the bishops and doctors of divinity from all parts of his Empire to meet in General Council at Nice in Bi-

[1] Noted Gnostics.

[2] It may be objected that the true *logos* was not derived from Platonic philosophy, inasmuch as John uses it in the first chapter of his gospel: "In the beginning was the word [*logos*]." In reply to this I remark, that I have proved by quotations from Knapp and Mosheim that the Platonic philosophers when brought into the church applied their philosophic notions to the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; also that some of these notions were that there were "three hypostases or natures in God;" and another was, that "God made all things through his *reason* or *word*," which term in Greek was *logos*. This they personified as being distinct from God. Again, it is evident the doctrine of the *logos* was not obtained from Scripture, from the fact that Augustine as late as the ending of the fourth century acknowledged (Lardner, vol. 3, p. 440) that after he renounced Manicheeism, he regarded Christ to have been a mere man *until he had read certain Platonic writers*. Again, if the Nicene Fathers had believed John taught the personal pre-existence of Jesus by his use of this word, why did they not use his testimony in their furious debates in the Nicene Council? In such an exciting time, when such testimony would have been so valuable, their entire silence upon it is presumptive evidence that no one in that age believed John taught it.

[3] Ruter's *Gregory*, p. 81.

thynia, to settle the question. After a stormy debate of two months continuance the Arians were defeated, and the majority concocted and adopted the following creed:[1]

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible, and in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten of the Father, that is of the *substance* of the Father, God of God, and Light of light, true God of true God, *begotten*, not *made;* con-substantial with the Father; by whom all things were made, both which are in heaven and on earth, who for the sake of us men and on account of our salvation, descended, became incarnate and was made man, suffered, arose again the third day and ascended into the heavens, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in the Holy Spirit."

Concerning the doings of this Council which established the above creed, Ruter thus writes:[2] "The term consubstantialist was conferred upon the opposers of the Arian doctrine by the council of Nice, the object of whose assembling has been already specified. In this council the Homoousian doctrine, or consubstantiality of *the three persons in the Godhead*, was declared a fundamental article of the Christian faith, and has been received as such by the Greek, the Latin, the Oriental, *and the Protestant Churches.*" It will be noticed however that this council, although they made this declaration, did not incorporate the doctrine of the trinity into their creed, but merely said concerning the third person, "We believe in the Holy Spirit;" hence there were at that time, according to the established belief, but *two* persons in the Godhead. But fifty-six years afterwards, at the General Council at Constantinople, they deposed Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, as a heretic for denying the personality of the Holy Spirit, and added to the Nicene creed, after the words *and we believe in the Holy Spirit*, the words—"the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets." Thus was introduced into the religious creed of Christendom the three persons constituting the Trinity; in reference to which Ruter remarks:[3] "These doctrines con-

[1] I give the Nicene Creed as I find it in Socrates' *Church History*. I find however in Eusebius' epistle to the Cæsareans an addition to it, but no change in the doctrines, as follows: "And the Catholic and Apostolic church doth anathematize those persons who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not; that he was not before he was born; that he was made from nothing, or of another substance or being; or that he is created, or changeable, or convertible."

[2] Ruter's *Gregory*, p. 73.

[3] *Ib.*

that no one knows the probation or generation, or nuncupation, or aduperation, or whatever name any one pleases to call this generation which is ineffable. Not Valentinus, nor Marcion,[1] nor Basilides, nor angels, nor arch-angels, nor principalities, nor powers; but only the Father who begat, and the Son who was begotten." Notwithstanding the opposition, however, the doctrine that Jesus was the incarnate *logos*[2] (a Greek term for the divine will or energy, borrowed from Platonic philosophy), whose existence they held was co-eval with the Father, became prevalent in the church as early as the close of the third century.

About this time the world became excited by the promulgation of a new theory by Arius, of whom Ruter[3] writes as follows: "The Trinitarian controversy was a deluge which overflowed the whole Christian world. Arius, a presbyter of the church of Alexandria, acute, eloquent, and subtle, contended in opposition to his bishop, Alexander, in an assembly of presbyters, that the Son was essentially distinct from the Father: that he was a dependent, spontaneous production, created by the will of the Father out of nothing; that he had been begotten before all worlds; but that there had been a time when he was not; that the Father had impressed upon him the effulgence of his glory; and transfused into him his ample Spirit; that he was the framer of the world and governor of the universe in obedience to the will of his Father and Monarch." This theory, so contrary to the prevailing opinion that he had existed as the *logos* from the beginning, was bitterly opposed by many, while others warmly sustained it. Thus arose the noted Arian controversy, which so distracted the church that Constantine (A. D. 323) summoned the bishops and doctors of divinity from all parts of his Empire to meet in General Council at Nice in Bi-

[1] Noted Gnostics.

[2] It may be objected that the true *logos* was not derived from Platonic philosophy, inasmuch as John uses it in the first chapter of his gospel: "In the beginning was the word [*logos*]." In reply to this I remark, that I have proved by quotations from Knapp and Mosheim that the Platonic philosophers when brought into the church applied their philosophic notions to the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; also that some of these notions were that there were "three hypostases or natures in God;" and another was, that "God made all things through his *reason* or *word*," which term in Greek was *logos*. This they personified as being distinct from God. Again, it is evident the doctrine of the *logos* was not obtained from Scripture, from the fact that Augustine as late as the ending of the fourth century acknowledged (Lardner, vol. 3, p. 440) that after he renounced Manicheeism, he regarded Christ to have been a mere man *until he had read certain Platonic writers*. Again, if the Nicene Fathers had believed John taught the personal pre-existence of Jesus by his use of this word, why did they not use his testimony in their furious debates in the Nicene Council? In such an exciting time, when such testimony would have been so valuable, their entire silence upon it is presumptive evidence that no one in that age believed John taught it.

[3] Ruter's *Gregory*, p. 81.

thynia, to settle the question. After a stormy debate of two months continuance the Arians were defeated, and the majority concocted and adopted the following creed:[1]

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible, and in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten of the Father, that is of the *substance* of the Father, God of God, and Light of light, true God of true God, *begotten*, not *made;* con-substantial with the Father; by whom all things were made, both which are in heaven and on earth, who for the sake of us men and on account of our salvation, descended, became incarnate and was made man, suffered, arose again the third day and ascended into the heavens, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in the Holy Spirit."

Concerning the doings of this Council which established the above creed, Ruter thus writes:[2] "The term consubstantialist was conferred upon the opposers of the Arian doctrine by the council of Nice, the object of whose assembling has been already specified. In this council the Homoousian doctrine, or consubstantiality of *the three persons in the Godhead*, was declared a fundamental article of the Christian faith, and has been received as such by the Greek, the Latin, the Oriental, *and the Protestant Churches.*" It will be noticed however that this council, although they made this declaration, did not incorporate the doctrine of the trinity into their creed, but merely said concerning the third person, "We believe in the Holy Spirit;" hence there were at that time, according to the established belief, but *two* persons in the Godhead. But fifty-six years afterwards, at the General Council at Constantinople, they deposed Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, as a heretic for denying the personality of the Holy Spirit, and added to the Nicene creed, after the words *and we believe in the Holy Spirit*, the words—"the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets." Thus was introduced into the religious creed of Christendom the three persons constituting the Trinity; in reference to which Ruter remarks:[3] "These doctrines con-

[1] I give the Nicene Creed as I find it in Socrates' *Church History*. I find however in Eusebius' epistle to the Cæsareans an addition to it, but no change in the doctrines, as follows: "And the Catholic and Apostolic church doth anathematize those persons who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not; that he was not before he was born; that he was made from nothing, or of another substance or being; or that he is created, or changeable, or convertible."

[2] Ruter's *Gregory*, p. 73.

[3] *Ib.*

cerning the nature of the Trinity, which in preceding ages *had escaped the vain curiosity of man*, and had been left *undefined by words* and *undetermined by any particular set of ideas*, excited considerable contest through the whole of this century. The semi-Arians violently attacked *the divinity of the Holy Spirit*, which was in the General Council of Constantinople discussed and defined, and the doctrine *of three persons and one God* established as the orthodox belief of the church."[1] But although thus established by the power of the majority, the agitation of the question continued, for it was difficult to reconcile the facts that Jesus hungered, thirsted, and slept; also that he prayed to the Father, and not only suffered but *died* on the cross, with the fact alleged in their creed that he was the eternal Father himself. To meet this perplexing question, Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, asserted,[1] "that there were in the Lord Jesus not only *two natures*, but *two persons*, one of which was the second person in the Trinity, and the other was the man Jesus, who possessed a human soul as well as body." This speculation not being congenial to the doctrine of the Trinity as enunciated in the creed, was condemned, and another Council called to settle the matter of the distinction between our Lord's divine and human nature. This Council assembled at Ephesus, A. D. 431, where it was determined[2] "that the Lord Jesus Christ in his exalted state was *one divine person*, in whom *two natures* (*i. e.*, divine and human) were most closely and intimately united, but without being mixed or confounded together."

Thus was elaborated in substance the doctrine of the Trinity as held sacred by orthodoxy to-day. And concerning the Councils which thus established it as an essential ingredient in the Christian faith, the Rev. H. Milman thus writes:[3]

"Nowhere is Christianity less attractive; and if we look to the ordinary tone and character of the proceedings, *less authoritative*, than in the councils of the church. It is in general a fierce collision of two rival factions, neither of which will yield, *each of which is solemnly pledged against conviction.* Intrigue, injustice, violence, decisions on authority alone, and that the authority of a turbulent majority, decisions by wild acclamation rather than after sober inquiry, detract from the reverence and impugn the judgment at last of the later Councils. Even the

[1] Hook's *Church Dictionary.*
[2] Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 379.
[3] *History of Christianity*, vol. 1, p. 157.

venerable Council of Nice commenced with mutual accusals and recriminations which were repressed by the moderation of the Emperor. The degeneracy is rapid from the Council of Nice to that of Ephesus, where each party came determined to use *every means* of haste, manœuvre, court-influence, and bribery to crush its adversary; and neither would scruple at any means to obtain the ratification of their anathemas by the persecution of the civil government."

I have now briefly brought to view the "voice of the Church" concerning what we must believe about Jesus in order to be orthodox, as enunciated by the Fathers in their several councils up to the middle of the fifth century. And although the agitation on this question did not entirely cease for several centuries after, yet no important changes were made in the doctrine, and the belief in the Trinity as determined by the Ephesian council is substantially the belief of popular Christendom at the present time.

And now I wish to call attention to an important fact, important as eternal life is important, left out of their creed, and consequently practically out of their faith, and not theirs alone, but of all denominations since who hold this doctrine as enunciated by them; for there is no doctrine more vital, none which stands in bolder relief throughout the Apostolic writings, than the fact that Jesus not only suffered, but *died*, and was RAISED FROM THE DEAD. By referring to their creed we perceive this item *was left out;* for they say he "suffered and rose again the third day;" thus ignoring the fact that he literally *died* and *was buried.* Nestorius, as before suggested, saw this inconsistency, and tried to amend it by asserting that Christ possessed not only two natures, but two distinct persons, and that the unity with the Father "was only of *will and affection.*" By this theory the Nestorians held the *man* Jesus literally died. But this view was condemned as a heresy, because it ignored the doctrine of his being *of the same essence* with the Father. Afterwards "Eutyches, an abbot of Constantinople, advanced and maintained the doctrine that there was only *one nature* in the Lord Jesus Christ; that he had a celestial body and not one of flesh, and consequently that his divine nature both suffered and died." This theory, admitting the death of the Son of God according to the plain declaration of Scripture, obtained many adherents, but was as objectionable with the dominant party as the Nestorian view, and

UMI

cerning the nature of the Trinity, which in preceding ages *had escaped the vain curiosity of man*, and had been left *undefined by words* and *undetermined by any particular set of ideas*, excited considerable contest through the whole of this century. The semi-Arians violently attacked *the divinity of the Holy Spirit*, which was in the General Council of Constantinople discussed and defined, and the doctrine *of three persons and one God* established as the orthodox belief of the church."[1] But although thus established by the power of the majority, the agitation of the question continued, for it was difficult to reconcile the facts that Jesus hungered, thirsted, and slept; also that he prayed to the Father, and not only suffered but *died* on the cross, with the fact alleged in their creed that he was the eternal Father himself. To meet this perplexing question, Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, asserted,[1] "that there were in the Lord Jesus not only *two natures*, but *two persons*, one of which was the second person in the Trinity, and the other was the man Jesus, who possessed a human soul as well as body." This speculation not being congenial to the doctrine of the Trinity as enunciated in the creed, was condemned, and another Council called to settle the matter of the distinction between our Lord's divine and human nature. This Council assembled at Ephesus, A. D. 431, where it was determined[2] "that the Lord Jesus Christ in his exalted state was *one divine person*, in whom *two natures* (*i. e.*, divine and human) were most closely and intimately united, but without being mixed or confounded together."

Thus was elaborated in substance the doctrine of the Trinity as held sacred by orthodoxy to-day. And concerning the Councils which thus established it as an essential ingredient in the Christian faith, the Rev. H. Milman thus writes:[3]

"Nowhere is Christianity less attractive; and if we look to the ordinary tone and character of the proceedings, *less authoritative*, than in the councils of the church. It is in general a fierce collision of two rival factions, neither of which will yield, *each of which is solemnly pledged against conviction.* Intrigue, injustice, violence, decisions on authority alone, and that the authority of a turbulent majority, decisions by wild acclamation rather than after sober inquiry, detract from the reverence and impugn the judgment at last of the later Councils. Even the

[1] Hook's *Church Dictionary.*
[2] Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 379.
[3] *History of Christianity*, vol. 1, p. 157.

venerable Council of Nice commenced with mutual accusals and recriminations which were repressed by the moderation of the Emperor. The degeneracy is rapid from the Council of Nice to that of Ephesus, where each party came determined to use *every means* of haste, manœuvre, court-influence, and bribery to crush its adversary; and neither would scruple at any means to obtain the ratification of their anathemas by the persecution of the civil government."

I have now briefly brought to view the "voice of the Church" concerning what we must believe about Jesus in order to be orthodox, as enunciated by the Fathers in their several councils up to the middle of the fifth century. And although the agitation on this question did not entirely cease for several centuries after, yet no important changes were made in the doctrine, and the belief in the Trinity as determined by the Ephesian council is substantially the belief of popular Christendom at the present time.

And now I wish to call attention to an important fact, important as eternal life is important, left out of their creed, and consequently practically out of their faith, and not theirs alone, but of all denominations since who hold this doctrine as enunciated by them; for there is no doctrine more vital, none which stands in bolder relief throughout the Apostolic writings, than the fact that Jesus not only suffered, but *died*, and was RAISED FROM THE DEAD. By referring to their creed we perceive this item *was left out;* for they say he "suffered and rose again the third day;" thus ignoring the fact that he literally *died* and *was buried.* Nestorius, as before suggested, saw this inconsistency, and tried to amend it by asserting that Christ possessed not only two natures, but two distinct persons, and that the unity with the Father "was only of *will and affection.*" By this theory the Nestorians held the *man* Jesus literally died. But this view was condemned as a heresy, because it ignored the doctrine of his being *of the same essence* with the Father. Afterwards "Eutyches, an abbot of Constantinople, advanced and maintained the doctrine that there was only *one nature* in the Lord Jesus Christ; that he had a celestial body and not one of flesh, and consequently that his divine nature both suffered and died." This theory, admitting the death of the Son of God according to the plain declaration of Scripture, obtained many adherents, but was as objectionable with the dominant party as the Nestorian view, and

UMI

the dissensions arising therefrom caused the calling of the fourth General Council, which met at Chalcedon, A. D. 451. This Council condemned Eutyches and his followers as heretics, and again affirmed that the orthodox faith was, that there were "two perfect and distinct natures, the divine and human, in the *unity of the person* of the Lord Jesus." Consequently the conclusion was inevitable, as his person was consubstantial (of the same substance) of the Father, he could not *die* in the literal sense of ceasing to exist; but when crucified the human nature only suffered, the divine beholding the scene physically unaffected, and upon its conclusion immediately accompanied by the soul of the penitent thief, ascended to Paradise.

This, in substance, is the doctrine of a Triune God, as established by the Fathers in their several Councils, and held sacred by orthodoxy to-day. And now I ask the candid reader to examine it carefully and compare it with the record God has given of his Son in his Word, and if you find it harmonizing with it, believe the dogma: but if on the other hand you find the record positively declares that God gave his only-begotten Son to *die*, the just for the unjust, to bring men to him, and save them from *perishing*, and this declaration backed by abundant apostolic testimony that he did literally die and was buried, not his body alone (Acts 2: 27), but his 'soul' also, and three days after was as literally by the power of the Father raised soul and body from the dead; if I say you find this plainly taught in the Bible, notwithstanding the decisions of Ecclesiastical Councils, or the frowns of popular orthodoxy, fearlessly endorse the record as there given, and unflinchingly defend it: for the Holy Scriptures alone "are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

Says Joseph Wolff, in a note to his remarks concerning the Fire-worshipers of Persia (Journal (1831), p. 79): "It is remarkable, that I have not hitherto met with a sect who believe in everlasting punishments, except Christians: neither Jews, nor Parsees, nor Buddhists, nor Hindoos believe it."

HAS HE COME?

By Eld. Geo. Thomson, Attica, Wis.

"If it were possible they shall deceive the very elect."—*Jesus.*

All Christians admit that the doctrine of the second coming of Christ is plainly taught in the Scriptures of divine truth. None will attempt to deny the statement of our Savior[1]—"And if I go and prepare a place for you, I WILL COME AGAIN." But all are not equally harmonious in their interpretation of the *manner* and *time* of his coming, whether his promise to return to this earth again is to be understood in a literal, or a spiritual sense; whether that promise, made by him who declared "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my *word shall not pass away*," has had its fulfillment in the past, or is an event still in the future; each of those views are entertained by the disciples of Jesus, and with honesty and sincerity no doubt. Yet those views are conflicting. Both cannot be correct: which is wrong? All Christians are profoundly interested in the decision. If this can be determined accurately it would doubtless tend more than any other one thing to reconstruct and harmonize the conflicting theories of modern Christianity, and bring about that union of believers so ardently longed for by all the disciples of Jesus. It is proposed in this article to investigate this important subject with the spirit of truth and candor, in the light of reason and Scripture. If it can be proven that Christ has already come, let us accept the evidence, and harmonize the Scriptures with that theory: if, on the other hand, it can be clearly demonstrated that he is yet to come literally, let us be candid enough to admit the fact, with its concomitant truths.

In the Scriptures relating to the second coming of Christ it is also predicted that certain events and circumstances will stand associated with that event: hence, when he comes, those events and circumstances must necessarily attend, or follow. In the early part of the year 1860 it was announced that the Prince of Wales would visit the Canadas, and that when he came he would inaugurate the great Victoria Tubular Bridge over the St. Law-

[1] John 14: 3.

the dissensions arising therefrom caused the calling of the fourth General Council, which met at Chalcedon, A. D. 451. This Council condemned Eutyches and his followers as heretics, and again affirmed that the orthodox faith was, that there were "two perfect and distinct natures, the divine and human, in the *unity of the person* of the Lord Jesus." Consequently the conclusion was inevitable, as his person was consubstantial (of the same substance) of the Father, he could not *die* in the literal sense of ceasing to exist; but when crucified the human nature only suffered, the divine beholding the scene physically unaffected, and upon its conclusion immediately accompanied by the soul of the penitent thief, ascended to Paradise.

This, in substance, is the doctrine of a Triune God, as established by the Fathers in their several Councils, and held sacred by orthodoxy to-day. And now I ask the candid reader to examine it carefully and compare it with the record God has given of his Son in his Word, and if you find it harmonizing with it, believe the dogma: but if on the other hand you find the record positively declares that God gave his only-begotten Son to *die*, the just for the unjust, to bring men to him, and save them from *perishing*, and this declaration backed by abundant apostolic testimony that he did literally die and was buried, not his body alone (Acts 2: 27), but his 'soul' also, and three days after was as literally by the power of the Father raised soul and body from the dead; if I say you find this plainly taught in the Bible, notwithstanding the decisions of Ecclesiastical Councils, or the frowns of popular orthodoxy, fearlessly endorse the record as there given, and unflinchingly defend it: for the Holy Scriptures alone "are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

Says Joseph Wolff, in a note to his remarks concerning the Fire-worshipers of Persia (Journal (1831), p. 79): "It is remarkable, that I have not hitherto met with a sect who believe in everlasting punishments, except Christians: neither Jews, nor Parsees, nor Buddhists, nor Hindoos believe it."

HAS HE COME?

By Eld. Geo. Thomson, Attica, Wis.

"If it were possible they shall deceive the very elect."—*Jesus.*

All Christians admit that the doctrine of the second coming of Christ is plainly taught in the Scriptures of divine truth. None will attempt to deny the statement of our Savior[1]—"And if I go and prepare a place for you, I WILL COME AGAIN." But all are not equally harmonious in their interpretation of the *manner* and *time* of his coming, whether his promise to return to this earth again is to be understood in a literal, or a spiritual sense; whether that promise, made by him who declared "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my *word shall not pass away*," has had its fulfillment in the past, or is an event still in the future; each of those views are entertained by the disciples of Jesus, and with honesty and sincerity no doubt. Yet those views are conflicting. Both cannot be correct: which is wrong? All Christians are profoundly interested in the decision. If this can be determined accurately it would doubtless tend more than any other one thing to reconstruct and harmonize the conflicting theories of modern Christianity, and bring about that union of believers so ardently longed for by all the disciples of Jesus. It is proposed in this article to investigate this important subject with the spirit of truth and candor, in the light of reason and Scripture. If it can be proven that Christ has already come, let us accept the evidence, and harmonize the Scriptures with that theory: if, on the other hand, it can be clearly demonstrated that he is yet to come literally, let us be candid enough to admit the fact, with its concomitant truths.

In the Scriptures relating to the second coming of Christ it is also predicted that certain events and circumstances will stand associated with that event: hence, when he comes, those events and circumstances must necessarily attend, or follow. In the early part of the year 1860 it was announced that the Prince of Wales would visit the Canadas, and that when he came he would inaugurate the great Victoria Tubular Bridge over the St. Law-

[1] John 14: 3.

rence River at Montreal; that he would also open the Crystal Palace at the same place for the Provincial Industrial Exhibition; and a number of other more or less remarkable or important acts were to be associated with his visit to Canada. When he came those things were accomplished, and when accomplished they were evidences that he had come. Let us now look at some of the announcements concerning the coming again of our Savior to this earth, and see if we can learn anything about the *manner* of his coming, and *what he will do* when he comes.

I. When he comes, literal and visible clouds will be associated with his advent.

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came *with the clouds of heaven.*"[1] It may be objected that this is a vision, therefore indefinite and uncertain in its application. The evidence shall not rest here; let the Savior speak: "And they shall see the Son of man coming *in the clouds of heaven.*"[2] "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man....coming *in the clouds of heaven.*"[3] The same declaration is recorded in Mark 13: 26 and Luke 21: 27. These clouds have been considered as merely symbolic, and have been popularly explained to mean clouds of events: but Jesus says, *clouds of heaven.* Clouds have always been conspicuous in the divine manifestations. In the exodus of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt the Lord went before in a cloud. In the passage of the Red Sea also the cloud was an important agent in their protection. Again in the wilderness, "the glory of the Lord appeared in a cloud."[4] Also, on Mount Sinai God spoke to Moses out of a cloud. Moses also entered the cloud, and when he came out his face was radiant with glory. The cloud rested on the tabernacle in the wilderness. When it was taken up, Israel journeyed; when it rested down, they halted. At the dedication of Solomon's Temple a cloud of glory filled the house. On the Mount of Transfiguration a cloud forms an important part of that exhibition in miniature of the future kingdom and glory. Those clouds were evidently something more than mere banks of fog, vapor, or smoke: they were clouds of glory—but none the less real and visible on that account.

Subsequent to the resurrection of the Lord, he remained with

[1] Dan. 7: 13.
[2] Matt. 24: 30.
[3] Matt. 26: 64.
[4] Exod. 16: 10.

the disciples forty days, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," and then,[1] "while they beheld, he was *taken up;* and a *cloud* received him out of their sight." Will any one assert that Christ ascended to heaven spiritually *in a cloud of events?* I believe the first attempt is yet to be made by any Christian to deny the literal ascension of Christ into heaven. If this fact then be conceded, what will we do with the testimony of the angels in v. 11—"Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? THIS SAME JESUS, which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come* IN LIKE MANNER as ye have seen him go into heaven." There can be no appropriateness in this emphatic language, unless the *coming again* is a counterpart of the *going.* Add to this the evidence of John[2]—"Behold, he cometh *with clouds,* and every eye shall see him," and the point is established beyond controversy.

II. When he comes the holy angels will accompany him.

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels."[3] "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and *all the holy angels with him.*"[4] "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words,....of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father *with the angels.*"[5] "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven *with his mighty angels.*"[6] Whether the second coming is past or future, these attendants—the angels and the glory—have been, or will be, inseparably connected with the event.

It may be claimed that all these might have attended a spiritual coming, as angels have been known to be present, yet invisible; but at that time those holy angels have a work assigned them, which will cause all of God's elect, at least, to be sensible of their presence. "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect, from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."[7] And again, as we learn from the following Scripture, a task is given them which can scarcely be accomplished without sinners being cognizant of the fact: "The Son of man shall send forth his an-

[1] Acts 1: 9.
[2] Rev. 1: 7.
[3] Matt. 16: 27.
[4] Matt. 25: 31.
[5] Mark 8: 38.
[6] 2 Thess. 1: 7.
[7] Matt. 24: 31.

rence River at Montreal; that he would also open the Crystal Palace at the same place for the Provincial Industrial Exhibition; and a number of other more or less remarkable or important acts were to be associated with his visit to Canada. When he came those things were accomplished, and when accomplished they were evidences that he had come. Let us now look at some of the announcements concerning the coming again of our Savior to this earth, and see if we can learn anything about the *manner* of his coming, and *what he will do* when he comes.

I. When he comes, literal and visible clouds will be associated with his advent.

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came *with the clouds of heaven.*"[1] It may be objected that this is a vision, therefore indefinite and uncertain in its application. The evidence shall not rest here; let the Savior speak: "And they shall see the Son of man coming *in the clouds of heaven.*"[2] "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man....coming *in the clouds of heaven.*"[3] The same declaration is recorded in Mark 13: 26 and Luke 21: 27. These clouds have been considered as merely symbolic, and have been popularly explained to mean clouds of events: but Jesus says, *clouds of heaven.* Clouds have always been conspicuous in the divine manifestations. In the exodus of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt the Lord went before in a cloud. In the passage of the Red Sea also the cloud was an important agent in their protection. Again in the wilderness, "the glory of the Lord appeared in a cloud."[4] Also, on Mount Sinai God spoke to Moses out of a cloud. Moses also entered the cloud, and when he came out his face was radiant with glory. The cloud rested on the tabernacle in the wilderness. When it was taken up, Israel journeyed; when it rested down, they halted. At the dedication of Solomon's Temple a cloud of glory filled the house. On the Mount of Transfiguration a cloud forms an important part of that exhibition in miniature of the future kingdom and glory. Those clouds were evidently something more than mere banks of fog, vapor, or smoke: they were clouds of glory—but none the less real and visible on that account.

Subsequent to the resurrection of the Lord, he remained with

[1] Dan. 7: 13.
[2] Matt. 24: 30.
[3] Matt. 26: 64.
[4] Exod. 16: 10.

the disciples forty days, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," and then,[1] "while they beheld, he was *taken up;* and a *cloud* received him out of their sight." Will any one assert that Christ ascended to heaven spiritually *in a cloud of events?* I believe the first attempt is yet to be made by any Christian to deny the literal ascension of Christ into heaven. If this fact then be conceded, what will we do with the testimony of the angels in v. 11—"Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? THIS SAME JESUS, which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come* IN LIKE MANNER as ye have seen him go into heaven." There can be no appropriateness in this emphatic language, unless the *coming again* is a counterpart of the *going.* Add to this the evidence of John[2]—"Behold, he cometh *with clouds,* and every eye shall see him," and the point is established beyond controversy.

II. When he comes the holy angels will accompany him.

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels."[3] "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and *all the holy angels with him.*"[4] "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words,....of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father *with the angels.*"[5] "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven *with his mighty angels.*"[6] Whether the second coming is past or future, these attendants—the angels and the glory—have been, or will be, inseparably connected with the event.

It may be claimed that all these might have attended a spiritual coming, as angels have been known to be present, yet invisible; but at that time those holy angels have a work assigned them, which will cause all of God's elect, at least, to be sensible of their presence. "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect, from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."[7] And again, as we learn from the following Scripture, a task is given them which can scarcely be accomplished without sinners being cognizant of the fact: "The Son of man shall send forth his an-

[1] Acts 1: 9.
[2] Rev. 1: 7.
[3] Matt. 16: 27.
[4] Matt. 25: 31.
[5] Mark 8: 38.
[6] 2 Thess. 1: 7.
[7] Matt. 24: 31.

gels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity."[1] When God sent his angels to gather his elect out of Sodom, and to destroy the wicked inhabitants thereof, both classes were aware of their presence. If that glory so frequently referred to as an accompaniment of the second advent was ever revealed, it most certainly was witnessed.

Our Savior's first advent was in humility and weakness, his second is to be in glory and power. The characteristics of his first advent were apparent, those of his second will be none the less so. Where is the record of these manifestations? Judge ye if they are in the past.

III. When he comes there will be a general lamentation.

"And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn."[2] "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and *all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.*"[3] It would be a most difficult and forced construction of terms to make "all the tribes of the earth" mean only the tribes of Israel, and "all kindreds of the earth" merely the Jews at Jerusalem. The Savior cautioned his people against this very mode of interpreting his coming. "Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert! go not forth. Behold, he is in the secret chambers! believe it not. [Why?] For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so *shall also the coming of the Son of man be.*"[4] This certainly teaches that his coming will not be clandestine, and known only to a few. It will not be in the desert, where no eye can see him; neither in the secret [or private] chambers, where the good man is compelled to yield to the pow- of his greatest enemy [death]: but it will be as universally apparent as the lightning's flash. "EVERY EYE SHALL SEE HIM."

IV. When he comes there is to be a resurrection from the dead.

"For the Lord himself shall *descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first."[5] "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised."[6] "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his

[1] Matt. 13 : 41.
[2] Matt. 24 : 30.
[3] Rev. 1 : 7.
[4] Matt. 24 : 26, 27.
[5] 1 Thess. 4 : 16.
[6] 1 Cor. 15 : 52.

own order. Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's AT HIS COMING."[1] Here is an event of importance, the resurrection of the righteous dead, at least, associated with Christ's coming. If a literal resurrection of the dead is taught in the Bible, it is clearly located at no other point of time. If Christ's second coming is in the past, then the sleeping saints have been resurrected. If the saints have not been resurrected, then the second coming of the Lord is an event still future.

But, says the objector, this is a spiritual resurrection. If a *spiritual resurrection*, it must be from a *spiritual death*, which is understood to be "*dead* IN *trespasses and sins.*" But those we have spoken of[2] are said to be "*the dead* IN *Christ.*" None but the severely obtuse can fail to discern the difference.

V. When Christ comes the second time, he will judge the living and the dead.

"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick [living] and the dead, *at his appearing* and kingdom."[3] "Therefore judge nothing *before the time* UNTIL THE LORD COME, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart."[4] Here the great Assize is clearly identified with the Second Advent. The great Apostle exhorted to a suspension of judgment until the *proper and legitimate time*, and declared that time to be WHEN THE LORD COMES. This seems to be in strict accord with reason, also, that man should not be judged until the end of the age, or dispensation. The idea that when men die they do immediately appear before God to be judged finds no authority whatever in the word of God. The Scriptures above quoted and referred to, prove (1) that God hath appointed a specific time to judge the world; (2) that time will be at, or subsequent to the second coming of Christ; and (3) the judge will be the Lord Jesus Christ.

VI. When he comes every man will get his reward.

"And behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man as his work shall be."[5] "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and THEN he shall reward *every man* according to his work."[6] If there is

[1] 1 Cor. 15 : 22, 23.
[2] 1 Thess. 4 : 16.
[3] 2 Tim. 4 : 1.
[4] 1 Cor. 4 : 5. See also Matt. 25 : 32, 33; Acts 17 : 31.
[5] Rev. 22 : 12.
[6] Matt. 16 : 27.

gels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity."[1] When God sent his angels to gather his elect out of Sodom, and to destroy the wicked inhabitants thereof, both classes were aware of their presence. If that glory so frequently referred to as an accompaniment of the second advent was ever revealed, it most certainly was witnessed.

Our Savior's first advent was in humility and weakness, his second is to be in glory and power. The characteristics of his first advent were apparent, those of his second will be none the less so. Where is the record of these manifestations? Judge ye if they are in the past.

III. When he comes there will be a general lamentation.

"And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn."[2] "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and *all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.*"[3] It would be a most difficult and forced construction of terms to make "all the tribes of the earth" mean only the tribes of Israel, and "all kindreds of the earth" merely the Jews at Jerusalem. The Savior cautioned his people against this very mode of interpreting his coming. "Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert! go not forth. Behold, he is in the secret chambers! believe it not. [Why?] For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so *shall also the coming of the Son of man be.*"[4] This certainly teaches that his coming will not be clandestine, and known only to a few. It will not be in the desert, where no eye can see him; neither in the secret [or private] chambers, where the good man is compelled to yield to the pow- of his greatest enemy [death]: but it will be as universally apparent as the lightning's flash. "EVERY EYE SHALL SEE HIM."

IV. When he comes there is to be a resurrection from the dead.

"For the Lord himself shall *descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first."[5] "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised."[6] "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his

[1] Matt. 13 : 41.
[2] Matt. 24 : 30.
[3] Rev. 1 : 7.
[4] Matt. 24 : 26, 27.
[5] 1 Thess. 4 : 16.
[6] 1 Cor. 15 : 52.

own order. Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's AT HIS COMING."[1] Here is an event of importance, the resurrection of the righteous dead, at least, associated with Christ's coming. If a literal resurrection of the dead is taught in the Bible, it is clearly located at no other point of time. If Christ's second coming is in the past, then the sleeping saints have been resurrected. If the saints have not been resurrected, then the second coming of the Lord is an event still future.

But, says the objector, this is a spiritual resurrection. If a *spiritual resurrection*, it must be from a *spiritual death*, which is understood to be "*dead* IN *trespasses and sins.*" But those we have spoken of[2] are said to be "*the dead* IN *Christ.*" None but the severely obtuse can fail to discern the difference.

V. When Christ comes the second time, he will judge the living and the dead.

"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick [living] and the dead, *at his appearing* and kingdom."[3] "Therefore judge nothing *before the time* UNTIL THE LORD COME, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart."[4] Here the great Assize is clearly identified with the Second Advent. The great Apostle exhorted to a suspension of judgment until the *proper and legitimate time*, and declared that time to be WHEN THE LORD COMES. This seems to be in strict accord with reason, also, that man should not be judged until the end of the age, or dispensation. The idea that when men die they do immediately appear before God to be judged finds no authority whatever in the word of God. The Scriptures above quoted and referred to, prove (1) that God hath appointed a specific time to judge the world; (2) that time will be at, or subsequent to the second coming of Christ; and (3) the judge will be the Lord Jesus Christ.

VI. When he comes every man will get his reward.

"And behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man as his work shall be."[5] "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and THEN he shall reward *every man* according to his work."[6] If there is

[1] 1 Cor. 15 : 22, 23.
[2] 1 Thess. 4 : 16.
[3] 2 Tim. 4 : 1.
[4] 1 Cor. 4 : 5. See also Matt. 25 : 32, 33; Acts 17 : 31.
[5] Rev. 22 : 12.
[6] Matt. 16 : 27.

any reliance to be placed upon language as representative of ideas, these words clearly and unmistakably locate the time when *all* shall be rewarded; and no less clearly associate that very important transaction with the second coming of Christ. If that event is in the past, then every man has received his final reward! Will any one assume such a position? The alternative is the coming of the Lord is still future. If any class of men should be peculiarly favored of heaven and be made exceptions to this rule, we might reasonably conclude it would be the holy prophets. But we learn[1] that they too must wait until the resurrection and judgment for their reward. "*And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.*"[2]

VII. When he comes he will sit in his throne as King, and his saints shall reign with him.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, THEN *shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.*"[3] There would be no propriety in this statement if the Savior had occupied *his* throne prior to that time. And the Savior has declared (in effect) since his ascension into heaven, that he is not yet seated on his own throne—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me *in my throne*, as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father *in his throne.*"[4] The grand old prophetic statements on this subject are also in full harmony with the above. "And I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him, and there was given him *dominion* and GLORY, and a KINGDOM."[5]

The pious worthies of all time have been cheered by the prospect of a home in the kingdom, and this hope has not been a baseless expectation, but a well-grounded assurance, predicated upon the promise of the Redeemer: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."[6] "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the

[1] Rev. 11:18.
[2] 1 Pet. 5:4.
[3] Matt. 25:31.
[4] Rev. 3:21.
[5] Dan. 7:13, 14.
[6] Luke 22:29, 30.

kingdom."[1] One grand and glorious strain of the anthem of redemption, as sung by the Apocalyptic host, is this: "Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall *reign on the earth.*"[2] But when shall this be? When shall these "exceeding great and precious promises" have their fulfillment? The following Scripture supplies the answer: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.... THEN shall the KING say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Futher, *inherit the kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world."[3] Then will that prayer (which is still proper and legitimate), that long-uttered petition, have its fulfillment—"Thy kingdom come!"

We conclude by referring to a fact, which is of itself a standing witness that the Lord has not yet come. We allude to the continued celebration of the Lord's Supper: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death TILL HE COME."[4] In this Scripture there is set forth not only the object of the Lord's Supper, but a plain limit to its duration as an ordinance—"*till he come.*" If he has come, the continuance of that ordinance in the church is inconsistent and unnecessary, because it has expired by limitation. But the ordinance is still perpetuated in the church, and every time the Christian partakes of those emblems of the broken body and shed blood of his Savior, he testifies by that act that his Lord has not yet come.

Other evidences might be presented in harmony with the foregoing to prove the fallacy of the idea of a spiritual coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at any other time. But enough has been presented to show which theory is sustained by Scripture evidence.

The reader will not fail to discern the important fact, that the resurrection, judgment, and reward of the saints are all dependent upon the second personal advent of their Lord. This fact wherever understood invests that event with extraordinary and absorbing interest, and gives force to Paul's fervent exhortation, the latter clause of which is now so sadly neglected in the professed church, that "we should live soberly, righteously, and

[1] Luke 19:22.
[2] Rev. 5:10.
[3] Matt. 25:31, 34.
[4] 1 Cor. 11:26.

UMI

any reliance to be placed upon language as representative of ideas, these words clearly and unmistakably locate the time when *all* shall be rewarded; and no less clearly associate that very important transaction with the second coming of Christ. If that event is in the past, then every man has received his final reward! Will any one assume such a position? The alternative is the coming of the Lord is still future. If any class of men should be peculiarly favored of heaven and be made exceptions to this rule, we might reasonably conclude it would be the holy prophets. But we learn[1] that they too must wait until the resurrection and judgment for their reward. "*And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.*"[2]

VII. When he comes he will sit in his throne as King, and his saints shall reign with him.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, THEN *shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.*"[3] There would be no propriety in this statement if the Savior had occupied *his* throne prior to that time. And the Savior has declared (in effect) since his ascension into heaven, that he is not yet seated on his own throne—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me *in my throne*, as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father *in his throne.*"[4] The grand old prophetic statements on this subject are also in full harmony with the above. "And I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him, and there was given him *dominion* and GLORY, and a KINGDOM."[5]

The pious worthies of all time have been cheered by the prospect of a home in the kingdom, and this hope has not been a baseless expectation, but a well-grounded assurance, predicated upon the promise of the Redeemer: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."[6] "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the

[1] Rev. 11:18.
[2] 1 Pet. 5:4.
[3] Matt. 25:31.
[4] Rev. 3:21.
[5] Dan. 7:13, 14.
[6] Luke 22:29, 30.

kingdom."[1] One grand and glorious strain of the anthem of redemption, as sung by the Apocalyptic host, is this: "Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall *reign on the earth.*"[2] But when shall this be? When shall these "exceeding great and precious promises" have their fulfillment? The following Scripture supplies the answer: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.... THEN shall the KING say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Futher, *inherit the kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world."[3] Then will that prayer (which is still proper and legitimate), that long-uttered petition, have its fulfillment—"Thy kingdom come!"

We conclude by referring to a fact, which is of itself a standing witness that the Lord has not yet come. We allude to the continued celebration of the Lord's Supper: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death TILL HE COME."[4] In this Scripture there is set forth not only the object of the Lord's Supper, but a plain limit to its duration as an ordinance—"*till he come.*" If he has come, the continuance of that ordinance in the church is inconsistent and unnecessary, because it has expired by limitation. But the ordinance is still perpetuated in the church, and every time the Christian partakes of those emblems of the broken body and shed blood of his Savior, he testifies by that act that his Lord has not yet come.

Other evidences might be presented in harmony with the foregoing to prove the fallacy of the idea of a spiritual coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at any other time. But enough has been presented to show which theory is sustained by Scripture evidence.

The reader will not fail to discern the important fact, that the resurrection, judgment, and reward of the saints are all dependent upon the second personal advent of their Lord. This fact wherever understood invests that event with extraordinary and absorbing interest, and gives force to Paul's fervent exhortation, the latter clause of which is now so sadly neglected in the professed church, that "we should live soberly, righteously, and

[1] Luke 19:22.
[2] Rev. 5:10.
[3] Matt. 25:31, 34.
[4] 1 Cor. 11:26.

UMI

godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." [1]

MISSIONARY THEOLOGY:

CONSIDERED IN ITS TWO DOCTRINES OF ENDLESS MISERY, AND A POST-MILLENNIAL ADVENT OF CHRIST.

The Rev. Dr. Mullens, Secretary to the London Missionary Society, in a recent work entitled *London and Calcutta*, designed to trace the outlines of Protestant Missions in India, and to stimulate the flagging zeal of their supporters, asks, "Why have Missionary Meetings failed so greatly to attract young men?" "Why are the very churches which once supported them best now giving to them only half of what they gave thirty years ago?" "Where are the crowded meetings which welcomed Williams, and Moffat, and Knibb, and listened to their stories?" "Were a DEEP, SETTLED INTEREST felt by Christian men at large in mission work abroad, these things could not be." Dr. Mullens answers these searching questions by an argument designed to prove that the causes of the comparative apathy are ignorance of the encouraging results already attained, and, above all, too exclusive devotion to the prosecution of the Home Missions of Christianity—an exclusiveness which robs Foreign Missions of their due share of attention and support. The larger part of Dr. Mullens' work is expended in setting forth the general social effects of Christianity in the East, and in presenting a brilliant picture of the results to be expected in the future from the gradual undermining of heathenism. The chief practical object of his book is, apparently, to persuade the churches to make larger pecuniary contributions to the funds of the missionary societies, under the idea that a few hundreds of additional missionaries will hasten the conversion of Asia to the belief of the gospel.

For Dr. Mullens, as a laborious missionary and able director of mission work, it is impossible not to entertain warm regard and very sincere reverence. It is not, however, inconsistent with that regard to offer a few suggestions in the way of further an-

[1] Titus 2 : 12, 13.

swer to the questions proposed by him, as to the causes of that decline of interest in missions which he confesses and laments.

It is not necessary to deny the force of the allegation that the churches at home devote a disproportionate measure of attention to English objects. Men are naturally interested in the visible more than in the invisible, in England, which is seen, more than in India; which is unseen. The spiritual force which is required to sustain a deep and settled interest in the missions of the gospel is far greater than is usually supposed. They make a larger demand upon the spiritual nature of man than any other form of human endeavor. To feel compassion for the souls of nations whom we have never beheld, from whom we are divided by the diameter of the globe, who are physically and morally our antipodes, with whose natural character we have the faintest sympathy—to expend thought, effort, and considerable property in furthering the interest of those unknown nations in a world which is still more completely invisible and unknown, requires a depth of conviction, a strength of principle, an elevation of spirit wholly foreign to ordinary human nature, and neither to be produced nor sustained except by the direct action of the Spirit of God.

The same Power which alone can "thrust forth" a true laborer into the harvest, can alone create or uphold a corresponding spirit of zeal, faith, and self-sacrifice in the churches which send him forth. The missionary agency abroad is the hand at the end of a long arm, extended by the Church at home. If that arm is paralysed at the shoulder, whence shall come the force by which blows shall be struck at the ends of the earth? A decline of the spiritual life, therefore, in England, a decay of faith in things unseen, a loss of spiritual power through the advance of habits of luxurious living, would necessarily take the form first of a loss of interest in the unseen field of foreign missions—a decline of interest soon to be followed by a similar decay in the work of God at home.

It is not my intention, however, to prosecute this line of inquiry. We shall proceed on the more agreeable hypothesis, that the concern for the salvation of the heathen nations is just as earnest and real as ever it was; and suggest a few considerations tending to explain the nature of those influences which have so greatly repressed of late years the exhibitions of interest in missionary societies in nearly all Christian communities.

UMI

godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." [1]

MISSIONARY THEOLOGY:

CONSIDERED IN ITS TWO DOCTRINES OF ENDLESS MISERY, AND A POST-MILLENNIAL ADVENT OF CHRIST.

The Rev. Dr. Mullens, Secretary to the London Missionary Society, in a recent work entitled *London and Calcutta*, designed to trace the outlines of Protestant Missions in India, and to stimulate the flagging zeal of their supporters, asks, "Why have Missionary Meetings failed so greatly to attract young men?" "Why are the very churches which once supported them best now giving to them only half of what they gave thirty years ago?" "Where are the crowded meetings which welcomed Williams, and Moffat, and Knibb, and listened to their stories?" "Were a DEEP, SETTLED INTEREST felt by Christian men at large in mission work abroad, these things could not be." Dr. Mullens answers these searching questions by an argument designed to prove that the causes of the comparative apathy are ignorance of the encouraging results already attained, and, above all, too exclusive devotion to the prosecution of the Home Missions of Christianity—an exclusiveness which robs Foreign Missions of their due share of attention and support. The larger part of Dr. Mullens' work is expended in setting forth the general social effects of Christianity in the East, and in presenting a brilliant picture of the results to be expected in the future from the gradual undermining of heathenism. The chief practical object of his book is, apparently, to persuade the churches to make larger pecuniary contributions to the funds of the missionary societies, under the idea that a few hundreds of additional missionaries will hasten the conversion of Asia to the belief of the gospel.

For Dr. Mullens, as a laborious missionary and able director of mission work, it is impossible not to entertain warm regard and very sincere reverence. It is not, however, inconsistent with that regard to offer a few suggestions in the way of further an-

[1] Titus 2 : 12, 13.

swer to the questions proposed by him, as to the causes of that decline of interest in missions which he confesses and laments.

It is not necessary to deny the force of the allegation that the churches at home devote a disproportionate measure of attention to English objects. Men are naturally interested in the visible more than in the invisible, in England, which is seen, more than in India; which is unseen. The spiritual force which is required to sustain a deep and settled interest in the missions of the gospel is far greater than is usually supposed. They make a larger demand upon the spiritual nature of man than any other form of human endeavor. To feel compassion for the souls of nations whom we have never beheld, from whom we are divided by the diameter of the globe, who are physically and morally our antipodes, with whose natural character we have the faintest sympathy—to expend thought, effort, and considerable property in furthering the interest of those unknown nations in a world which is still more completely invisible and unknown, requires a depth of conviction, a strength of principle, an elevation of spirit wholly foreign to ordinary human nature, and neither to be produced nor sustained except by the direct action of the Spirit of God.

The same Power which alone can "thrust forth" a true laborer into the harvest, can alone create or uphold a corresponding spirit of zeal, faith, and self-sacrifice in the churches which send him forth. The missionary agency abroad is the hand at the end of a long arm, extended by the Church at home. If that arm is paralysed at the shoulder, whence shall come the force by which blows shall be struck at the ends of the earth? A decline of the spiritual life, therefore, in England, a decay of faith in things unseen, a loss of spiritual power through the advance of habits of luxurious living, would necessarily take the form first of a loss of interest in the unseen field of foreign missions—a decline of interest soon to be followed by a similar decay in the work of God at home.

It is not my intention, however, to prosecute this line of inquiry. We shall proceed on the more agreeable hypothesis, that the concern for the salvation of the heathen nations is just as earnest and real as ever it was; and suggest a few considerations tending to explain the nature of those influences which have so greatly repressed of late years the exhibitions of interest in missionary societies in nearly all Christian communities.

UMI

I. And in the first place, I venture to assign as one cause of the indisputable decline of interest in the existing foreign missions of the gospel, *a growing scepticism as to the theory on which they are established.*

In the apostolic age the doctrinal spirit and the missionary spirit were evolved by the Spirit of God in the church with equal power, and they ought never to be separated. Each requires combination with the other.

It has unhappily happened several times since that each has been developed alone. In some ages a spirit of missions has been developed apart from the spirit of doctrinal study, as in the second and third, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In other cases, the doctrinal spirit has been evolved without a corresponding activity of the spirit which leads to the diffusion of the gospel. At the close of the last century, when the existing Protestant missionary societies arose amidst the hurricanes of the French Revolution, the spirit of theological study, of careful, bold, devout, biblical criticism, on which the faith ought to be founded, was as nearly as possible defunct in England. Perhaps we may say that just at the very time when it became of more importance than ever that the church should take care what was to be taught as Christianity among the nations of the world, the work of evangelizing was commenced, as it had been in several similar preceding ages of activity in Christendom, in a spirit of unquestioning submission to the forms of thought and expression stereotyped by previous generations. Never was any great enterprise begun with more simplicity of purpose, with more heroic faith, with more devoted piety, than the enterprise of the founders of the Baptist, and Independent, and Episcopal Missions, at the close of the last century; and also, it must be added, never was any great enterprise begun with more unquestioning adhesion to the traditions of the fathers. There was scarcely a man among the whole company of persons engaged in that glorious undertaking who ever dreamed of doubting any of the doctrines stamped with the imprimatur of the sixteenth century Reformation. The powers of action awoke, as often before, in isolation, and the power of thought and truth-seeking still for the most part slumbered.

What has been the result of this phenomenon? Is it not this, that inasmuch as the theological spirit has since recovered its energy in the churches, and attention has been devoted once more to biblical criticism and doctrine, there is now a certain separation between the missions of Protestantism and the deeper home convictions of religious Englishmen. The Missionary Societies represent the thinking of seventy years ago, when the church accepted without question the traditions of Protestant theology handed down by the Reformers. But they are surrounded by a generation which has lifted the anchors of its theology, and which has drifted or sailed into other waters. In some of the most important particulars of Christian faith, indeed, there is no change. The faith in a divine Christ, in an atonement for sin, in the person and work of the Holy Spirit, in a gratuitous justification, is the same now as it was of old. But these doctrines were considered by the founders of missions as but a superstructure built on a deeper foundation. That foundation was an antecedent belief in the natural immortality of mankind, and their consequent destiny either to endless misery or endless joy. In the opinion of Dr. Carey, and those who first went with him to India, as well as of the churches in Britain, every human being was an immortal, was possessed of a soul as eternal in the future as the nature of God. Every inhabitant of India was thus regarded as an immortal. Every unregenerate soul, descended from Adam, was born under the curse of endless woe, and was, by its own sins, confirmed in that direful destiny. Salvation could be effected only by the distinguishing grace of God in regeneration. All the unregenerate of all ages were unsaved, and the unsaved of India, as of all lands, were destined to be delivered over, as Dr. Carey says in one of his letters, to "endless misery." To endless misery had gone all the numberless unregenerate inhabitants of Asia during the ages of darkness preceding the advent of Dr. Carey to India. To "endless misery" were going all the millions who rejected his message, or refused to abandon their ancestral creeds. This is still the foundation of missionary theology. This is still what may be called the State Creed of all the missionary societies. No one is considered at liberty to deny it in a missionary speech or sermon. It is the platform creed of Exeter Hall. The missionary students at the colleges are supposed to believe it. The directors are supposed to believe it. The missionaries abroad are supposed to believe it. No one who openly assailed it would be asked to assist at a missionary assembly, or to plead the cause of missions before the people.

UMI

I. And in the first place, I venture to assign as one cause of the indisputable decline of interest in the existing foreign missions of the gospel, *a growing scepticism as to the theory on which they are established.*

In the apostolic age the doctrinal spirit and the missionary spirit were evolved by the Spirit of God in the church with equal power, and they ought never to be separated. Each requires combination with the other.

It has unhappily happened several times since that each has been developed alone. In some ages a spirit of missions has been developed apart from the spirit of doctrinal study, as in the second and third, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In other cases, the doctrinal spirit has been evolved without a corresponding activity of the spirit which leads to the diffusion of the gospel. At the close of the last century, when the existing Protestant missionary societies arose amidst the hurricanes of the French Revolution, the spirit of theological study, of careful, bold, devout, biblical criticism, on which the faith ought to be founded, was as nearly as possible defunct in England. Perhaps we may say that just at the very time when it became of more importance than ever that the church should take care what was to be taught as Christianity among the nations of the world, the work of evangelizing was commenced, as it had been in several similar preceding ages of activity in Christendom, in a spirit of unquestioning submission to the forms of thought and expression stereotyped by previous generations. Never was any great enterprise begun with more simplicity of purpose, with more heroic faith, with more devoted piety, than the enterprise of the founders of the Baptist, and Independent, and Episcopal Missions, at the close of the last century; and also, it must be added, never was any great enterprise begun with more unquestioning adhesion to the traditions of the fathers. There was scarcely a man among the whole company of persons engaged in that glorious undertaking who ever dreamed of doubting any of the doctrines stamped with the imprimatur of the sixteenth century Reformation. The powers of action awoke, as often before, in isolation, and the power of thought and truth-seeking still for the most part slumbered.

What has been the result of this phenomenon? Is it not this, that inasmuch as the theological spirit has since recovered its energy in the churches, and attention has been devoted once more to biblical criticism and doctrine, there is now a certain separation between the missions of Protestantism and the deeper home convictions of religious Englishmen. The Missionary Societies represent the thinking of seventy years ago, when the church accepted without question the traditions of Protestant theology handed down by the Reformers. But they are surrounded by a generation which has lifted the anchors of its theology, and which has drifted or sailed into other waters. In some of the most important particulars of Christian faith, indeed, there is no change. The faith in a divine Christ, in an atonement for sin, in the person and work of the Holy Spirit, in a gratuitous justification, is the same now as it was of old. But these doctrines were considered by the founders of missions as but a superstructure built on a deeper foundation. That foundation was an antecedent belief in the natural immortality of mankind, and their consequent destiny either to endless misery or endless joy. In the opinion of Dr. Carey, and those who first went with him to India, as well as of the churches in Britain, every human being was an immortal, was possessed of a soul as eternal in the future as the nature of God. Every inhabitant of India was thus regarded as an immortal. Every unregenerate soul, descended from Adam, was born under the curse of endless woe, and was, by its own sins, confirmed in that direful destiny. Salvation could be effected only by the distinguishing grace of God in regeneration. All the unregenerate of all ages were unsaved, and the unsaved of India, as of all lands, were destined to be delivered over, as Dr. Carey says in one of his letters, to "endless misery." To endless misery had gone all the numberless unregenerate inhabitants of Asia during the ages of darkness preceding the advent of Dr. Carey to India. To "endless misery" were going all the millions who rejected his message, or refused to abandon their ancestral creeds. This is still the foundation of missionary theology. This is still what may be called the State Creed of all the missionary societies. No one is considered at liberty to deny it in a missionary speech or sermon. It is the platform creed of Exeter Hall. The missionary students at the colleges are supposed to believe it. The directors are supposed to believe it. The missionaries abroad are supposed to believe it. No one who openly assailed it would be asked to assist at a missionary assembly, or to plead the cause of missions before the people.

UMI

And yet, it is disbelieved in the churches throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is doubted and denied with varying degrees of confidence. But it *is* doubted and denied almost universally; and most of all by persons of accurate knowledge and spiritual intelligence. The doubt and denial is not confined to sceptics, to mockers, to adversaries; but it is professed with more or less of openness by men whose knowledge gives the utmost weight to their judgment, and whose hardworking piety challenges comparison with that of any of the advocates of the older creed. One meets with a few earnest, and able, and unquestionably sincere, controversial supporters of that elder belief. The names of Dr. Pusey, of Dr. Salmon of Dublin, and of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, will occur to all readers. But no one who intimately knows English religious society will venture to deny that there has been an immense revolution in opinion as to the probable destiny of the ignorant idolatrous nations of the earth, and that it is the rarest thing to find even a secretary of a missionary society, or the tutor of a missionary college, who will, *when firmly pressed*, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the opinions on this question of the founders of our missionary societies. Men, nowadays, have their doubts, their special theories of relief, their hopes, or their positive doctrines. Either they hold, as I am informed that some heads of colleges hold, that Scripture gives room for several opposite theories; or they lean to Universalism, and teach men to trust in future purgatories; or they wholly repudiate and openly denounce and assail the old missionary doctrine, and believe with us that they who have "sinned without law," and led impenitent lives under heathen doctrines, shall "perish without law," and "die" with "few stripes;" but it is simply a fact that opinion has changed and is changing here, and that the churches at home, acted upon by the revived spirit of doctrinal study, are silent where our fathers would have spoken, or doubt where they would have unhesitatingly followed the doctrine of the dark ages, or boldly deny where they would have awfully anathematized opposition. No one seems moved by the argument that such good men as our fathers were must have been right in all their doctrines. We know, as a matter of fact, that they were wholly mistaken in many things which they firmly believed. The truth is that Nature, and Scripture, and human life, are better understood than they were seventy years ago, and the conviction is widely spread that the ancient notion of the consignment to everlasting torment of the countless multitudes of the heathen who have been born in error, bred up in superstition, and who were abandoned to die either in total ignorance of the true gospel, or in rejection of a gospel message only partly revealed to them, *cannot possibly be true* under the government of Infinite Justice, Boundless Wisdom, and Eternal Love.

The general result is, that the religious public feel that the unchanged missionary theology does not, in some important respects, represent their present thoughts, and thence follows a decline of interest in the propagation of ideas no longer believed. Few men of the first class, in either honesty or ability, offer themselves for missionary work. It is understood that the studies of college life are not likely to lead always to the faith of our forefathers: hence, since open denial, or opposition, or avowed scepticism is forbidden, strong men shrink from a vocation in which integrity of thought and speech will become penal; and the missionary work is delivered over to persons of a more compliant and docile constitution—men also will continue to utter in the ears of the heathen the monstrous, unrealized propositions of a former day, or worse, who will keep silence about hell altogether.

I attribute, therefore, the decline of interest in missionary societies to an unconfessed partial destruction of the faith on which they were founded, and for the propagation of which they are maintained. Men feel coldly toward a system which sends out missionaries, whose training at home consists very much in persuading them *not to think* conclusively of the questions of human retribution and destiny; and which discourages the expression of belief, whether at home or abroad, in a sense accordant with the maturest thought of the English churches. The persuasion is universal, that the missions of the gospel ought to represent the results of England's most earnest studies. It is felt that they do not represent them. It is felt that this state of things ought to be altered—that there ought to be more space allowed both at college, and in the mission field, certainly for doubt, for undecided opinion, and even for open variation from the ancient creed—that there ought to be liberty for missionaries to express abroad, especially in their dealings with the educated men of India and China, ideas which are gaining ascendancy over the best minds at home. It is felt that the gov-

UMI

And yet, it is disbelieved in the churches throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is doubted and denied with varying degrees of confidence. But it *is* doubted and denied almost universally; and most of all by persons of accurate knowledge and spiritual intelligence. The doubt and denial is not confined to sceptics, to mockers, to adversaries; but it is professed with more or less of openness by men whose knowledge gives the utmost weight to their judgment, and whose hardworking piety challenges comparison with that of any of the advocates of the older creed. One meets with a few earnest, and able, and unquestionably sincere, controversial supporters of that elder belief. The names of Dr. Pusey, of Dr. Salmon of Dublin, and of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, will occur to all readers. But no one who intimately knows English religious society will venture to deny that there has been an immense revolution in opinion as to the probable destiny of the ignorant idolatrous nations of the earth, and that it is the rarest thing to find even a secretary of a missionary society, or the tutor of a missionary college, who will, *when firmly pressed*, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the opinions on this question of the founders of our missionary societies. Men, nowadays, have their doubts, their special theories of relief, their hopes, or their positive doctrines. Either they hold, as I am informed that some heads of colleges hold, that Scripture gives room for several opposite theories; or they lean to Universalism, and teach men to trust in future purgatories; or they wholly repudiate and openly denounce and assail the old missionary doctrine, and believe with us that they who have "sinned without law," and led impenitent lives under heathen doctrines, shall "perish without law," and "die" with "few stripes;" but it is simply a fact that opinion has changed and is changing here, and that the churches at home, acted upon by the revived spirit of doctrinal study, are silent where our fathers would have spoken, or doubt where they would have unhesitatingly followed the doctrine of the dark ages, or boldly deny where they would have awfully anathematized opposition. No one seems moved by the argument that such good men as our fathers were must have been right in all their doctrines. We know, as a matter of fact, that they were wholly mistaken in many things which they firmly believed. The truth is that Nature, and Scripture, and human life, are better understood than they were seventy years ago, and the conviction is widely spread that the ancient notion of the consignment to everlasting torment of the countless multitudes of the heathen who have been born in error, bred up in superstition, and who were abandoned to die either in total ignorance of the true gospel, or in rejection of a gospel message only partly revealed to them, *cannot possibly be true* under the government of Infinite Justice, Boundless Wisdom, and Eternal Love.

The general result is, that the religious public feel that the unchanged missionary theology does not, in some important respects, represent their present thoughts, and thence follows a decline of interest in the propagation of ideas no longer believed. Few men of the first class, in either honesty or ability, offer themselves for missionary work. It is understood that the studies of college life are not likely to lead always to the faith of our forefathers: hence, since open denial, or opposition, or avowed scepticism is forbidden, strong men shrink from a vocation in which integrity of thought and speech will become penal; and the missionary work is delivered over to persons of a more compliant and docile constitution—men also will continue to utter in the ears of the heathen the monstrous, unrealized propositions of a former day, or worse, who will keep silence about hell altogether.

I attribute, therefore, the decline of interest in missionary societies to an unconfessed partial destruction of the faith on which they were founded, and for the propagation of which they are maintained. Men feel coldly toward a system which sends out missionaries, whose training at home consists very much in persuading them *not to think* conclusively of the questions of human retribution and destiny; and which discourages the expression of belief, whether at home or abroad, in a sense accordant with the maturest thought of the English churches. The persuasion is universal, that the missions of the gospel ought to represent the results of England's most earnest studies. It is felt that they do not represent them. It is felt that this state of things ought to be altered—that there ought to be more space allowed both at college, and in the mission field, certainly for doubt, for undecided opinion, and even for open variation from the ancient creed—that there ought to be liberty for missionaries to express abroad, especially in their dealings with the educated men of India and China, ideas which are gaining ascendancy over the best minds at home. It is felt that the gov-

UMI

erning power of missions ought not to be exclusively in the hands of men who think on all subjects as our fathers did seventy years ago—or worse still, in the hands of men who only *pretend* to think as they did. It is felt that Jesuitism among Protestants is just as demoralizing as among Romanists; that what is needed in missionary work above all things is, not concealment of opinion, not hidden doubt, not a weak compliance with the articles insisted on by ignorant multitudes, but earnest, overwhelming faith, a faith which believes, and therefore speaks, a faith which can blow beside the walls of Jericho a "dolorous and jarring blast," before which the defences of heathenism will crumble to the ground. And until the realities of the future world occupy a far larger space in the thoughts of missionary Secretaries, and missionary Directors, the feeling of English churches toward them is not likely to improve. Meanwhile it may be noted as a symptom of the disorder complained of, that even Mr. Mullens' own book on missions, admirable man as he is, does not contain a single vigorous reference to heaven or hell; and that for aught that explicitly appears on his pages, replete with statistical information, the work of missions might almost be taken to refer to some movement for man's temporal salvation. A state of thought, which takes heaven and hell for granted, when treating on missions to the heathen, requires some reform.

II. Another reason for the decline of interest in missionary societies, will I think be found in *the failure of spiritual results.* This failure has sunk deeply into the heart of England. Public opinion has begun to form itself under other influences than missionary reports and missionary speeches. These tell but a portion of the truth. That which is favorable is generally published. That which is unfavorable is withheld. We are beginning to learn not only who are converted, but who are unconverted; not only what the missionaries think of the learned and able men of India and China, but what the learned men of China and India think of some things taught by the missionaries. We are learning to compare resources and results. We are learning to exercise imagination upon the missionary enterprise, and to understand how it must appear to the "natives" whose religions it assails.

For example, we now comprehend that the presence of our ing handful of European missionaries in the ports of China, bring-with them a "gospel," of which the fundamental doctrine is that all

former inhabitants of China, who have been atheists or idolaters; that is, the larger proportion of that stupendous population, during many ages, and who have died in an unregenerate condition, have gone to endless misery—strikes the educated men of China precisely as a similar message would strike the learned men of our Universities, if brought to England after ages of heathenism, by a handful of Chinese missionaries, landing in the ports of London and Liverpool. We can now understand that if it would be highly improbable that our literati would listen to so horrible a proclamation, or recognize in it the voice of a just and benevolent Deity, so it is equally improbable that it will appear Divine when taught by our missionaries at Pekin or Ningpo. And thus we come to comprehend at least some of the reasons, which, after seventy years of labor, the learned and educated classes of both India and China are as far as ever from embracing Christianity. Chinese clergymen, with a similar doctrine at London and Liverpool, could scarcely hope for greater success among ourselves.

Further, the public, after fully believing and appreciating the cheering declarations of our missionary writers as to the social revolution which is gradually advancing throughout the earth, the civilizing process which is supposed to augur a favorable future for Christianity—nevertheless have learned to study the reports of *known and actual conversion* with profound disquietude, and have settled into the opinion that there must be "some awful mistake somewhere," as Mrs. Stowe expresses it, in the ideas presented for acceptance to the multitudinous Orient. In India there are 180,000,000 of people. In China there are 400,000,000 more. Now all the confessed living converts to Christianity, in India, after seventy years of labor, by thirty-one missionary societies, are at this moment not much over 30,000, the far larger proportion of these being persons of the lowest rank in intelligence. Around these professed converts there is a *Christianized* population of a quarter of a million. We thank God for even such results. But it is impossible to forget what these figures mean. They mean that if you cause to pass before you all the inhabitants of India in ranks of thirty abreast, and marching a yard apart, you would have a column extending from the Land's End in Cornwall to the edge of the Caspian Sea, while the converts to Christianity would be represented by one thousand of these ranks of thirty. If the whole population

erning power of missions ought not to be exclusively in the hands of men who think on all subjects as our fathers did seventy years ago—or worse still, in the hands of men who only *pretend* to think as they did. It is felt that Jesuitism among Protestants is just as demoralizing as among Romanists; that what is needed in missionary work above all things is, not concealment of opinion, not hidden doubt, not a weak compliance with the articles insisted on by ignorant multitudes, but earnest, overwhelming faith, a faith which believes, and therefore speaks, a faith which can blow beside the walls of Jericho a "dolorous and jarring blast," before which the defences of heathenism will crumble to the ground. And until the realities of the future world occupy a far larger space in the thoughts of missionary Secretaries, and missionary Directors, the feeling of English churches toward them is not likely to improve. Meanwhile it may be noted as a symptom of the disorder complained of, that even Mr. Mullens' own book on missions, admirable man as he is, does not contain a single vigorous reference to heaven or hell; and that for aught that explicitly appears on his pages, replete with statistical information, the work of missions might almost be taken to refer to some movement for man's temporal salvation. A state of thought, which takes heaven and hell for granted, when treating on missions to the heathen, requires some reform.

II. Another reason for the decline of interest in missionary societies, will I think be found in *the failure of spiritual results.* This failure has sunk deeply into the heart of England. Public opinion has begun to form itself under other influences than missionary reports and missionary speeches. These tell but a portion of the truth. That which is favorable is generally published. That which is unfavorable is withheld. We are beginning to learn not only who are converted, but who are unconverted; not only what the missionaries think of the learned and able men of India and China, but what the learned men of China and India think of some things taught by the missionaries. We are learning to compare resources and results. We are learning to exercise imagination upon the missionary enterprise, and to understand how it must appear to the "natives" whose religions it assails.

For example, we now comprehend that the presence of our ing handful of European missionaries in the ports of China, bring-with them a "gospel," of which the fundamental doctrine is that all

former inhabitants of China, who have been atheists or idolaters; that is, the larger proportion of that stupendous population, during many ages, and who have died in an unregenerate condition, have gone to endless misery—strikes the educated men of China precisely as a similar message would strike the learned men of our Universities, if brought to England after ages of heathenism, by a handful of Chinese missionaries, landing in the ports of London and Liverpool. We can now understand that if it would be highly improbable that our literati would listen to so horrible a proclamation, or recognize in it the voice of a just and benevolent Deity, so it is equally improbable that it will appear Divine when taught by our missionaries at Pekin or Ningpo. And thus we come to comprehend at least some of the reasons, which, after seventy years of labor, the learned and educated classes of both India and China are as far as ever from embracing Christianity. Chinese clergymen, with a similar doctrine at London and Liverpool, could scarcely hope for greater success among ourselves.

Further, the public, after fully believing and appreciating the cheering declarations of our missionary writers as to the social revolution which is gradually advancing throughout the earth, the civilizing process which is supposed to augur a favorable future for Christianity—nevertheless have learned to study the reports of *known and actual conversion* with profound disquietude, and have settled into the opinion that there must be "some awful mistake somewhere," as Mrs. Stowe expresses it, in the ideas presented for acceptance to the multitudinous Orient. In India there are 180,000,000 of people. In China there are 400,000,000 more. Now all the confessed living converts to Christianity, in India, after seventy years of labor, by thirty-one missionary societies, are at this moment not much over 30,000, the far larger proportion of these being persons of the lowest rank in intelligence. Around these professed converts there is a *Christianized* population of a quarter of a million. We thank God for even such results. But it is impossible to forget what these figures mean. They mean that if you cause to pass before you all the inhabitants of India in ranks of thirty abreast, and marching a yard apart, you would have a column extending from the Land's End in Cornwall to the edge of the Caspian Sea, while the converts to Christianity would be represented by one thousand of these ranks of thirty. If the whole population

passed in single file before the eye, and three seconds were allowed to gaze with awful interest as to his eternal destiny upon each dusky countenance, it would require thirty years, of days of twelve hours each, to survey the whole. But the living nominal converts to Christianity from over the whole of India would pass, at the same rate of movement, in twenty-five hours. In China the known results of missionary action are even more appallingly small. You may, indeed, hope that there are thousands of Nicodemuses in both India and China, a hope at once reasonable and encouraging, and thousands more of men saved by the Spirit in their own twilights, but surely there is some apparent deficiency in the power of modern Christianity. Where is the arm that smote Rahab? Where is the power of truth and grace that smote the philosophies and idolatries of the Mediterranean in the apostolic age, and shook the whole of Europe and Asia in a single generation? Let it not be said, it was the force of miracles that then availed. Miracles exerted an inconsiderable influence in comparison with a truth which commended itself to all consciences, a grace that commended itself to all affections, and a terror which struck like a thunderbolt from the uplifted hand of the Almighty.

Is it not that we are propagating a Christianity which is half paralyzed in its two chief forces of hope and fear through the perversions of a corrupted theology? We fail in thoroughly presenting God's love to the nations, a love strong enough to melt even Chinese arrogance, and to develop the belief of a personal God even among Chinese atheists, because we have encumbered Christianity with a doctrine of hell, so unjust, so indiscriminate, so hardening in its frightful propositions, that men's consciences refuse to receive it. Missionary theology cannot "commend itself to every man's conscience," because every man's conscience, whether in Europe or Asia, in proportion as it is enlightened, rejects it with horror. This is doubtless one principal reason for the general rejection of the gospel by the Brahmins, Bhuddists, and Confucianists of the East. God's love is hidden from them, and they "turn away sorrowful" from so direful a Christianity. Sir John Bowring says, in his work on Siam, that he never yet met with a learned Bhuddist who could speak with patience of the doctrine of the missionaries on the hell of England and America. Now whatever the better sort of thinking

men of any nation generally reject, will not be widely received by the uneducated.

III. But the prevailing system of teaching among missionaries fails also in another department—fails through withholding the influence of a truth favorable to the production alike of hope and of fear. Not only does the hell preached by the missionaries fail by its unscriptural representations to awaken terror in the educated classes, since whatever you exaggerate you weaken, but it is nearly everywhere the custom with missionary societies to send out men opposed to the belief of Christ's advent to judge the nations at the destruction of the Apostasy. The plain doctrine of Paul, in the second letter to the Thessalonians, that the personal advent of Christ will occur for the purpose of destroying "the man of sin;" the plain doctrine of the prophets that the "Son of man comes in the clouds of heaven" for the destruction of the "fourth" empire, and of the "horn that has eyes, and a mouth speaking marvelous things;" the plain doctrine that Christ will come to punish "with flaming fire" a church that has perverted Christianity until men can no longer believe in it, and to judge nations that persist in idolatry after due summons to repentance—this doctrine of Christ's "pre-millennial" advent, under the influence and expectation of which the gospel was indisputably spread in the first century, is systematically exploded and denied by the missionary societies, and the generality of missionaries. And here is a loss of power which may be readily appreciated. Let the gospel be preached in India and China as the message of life to the dead, as the promise of immortality in body and soul to a race sitting in darkness and death shade; let it be preached as the message of a God who is intelligibly loving, and intelligibly and justly severe; let it be preached that the "times of ignorance a gracious God winked at," *overlooked*, "but now commands all men everywhere to repent; let the words of the angel of the everlasting gospel, in the Apocalypse, become the text of missionary preaching, "Fear God, and give glory to him, *for the hour of his judgment is come!*" and one cannot but believe that a new power will attend in the East the proclamation of Christianity. There is something so striking, so fitted to compel attention, in the warning of Christ's speedy advent to "judge the nations," to destroy obstinate worshipers of idols, to avenge the rejection of the truth, to raise the dead saints, and to establish

UMI

passed in single file before the eye, and three seconds were allowed to gaze with awful interest as to his eternal destiny upon each dusky countenance, it would require thirty years, of days of twelve hours each, to survey the whole. But the living nominal converts to Christianity from over the whole of India would pass, at the same rate of movement, in twenty-five hours. In China the known results of missionary action are even more appallingly small. You may, indeed, hope that there are thousands of Nicodemuses in both India and China, a hope at once reasonable and encouraging, and thousands more of men saved by the Spirit in their own twilights, but surely there is some apparent deficiency in the power of modern Christianity. Where is the arm that smote Rahab? Where is the power of truth and grace that smote the philosophies and idolatries of the Mediterranean in the apostolic age, and shook the whole of Europe and Asia in a single generation? Let it not be said, it was the force of miracles that then availed. Miracles exerted an inconsiderable influence in comparison with a truth which commended itself to all consciences, a grace that commended itself to all affections, and a terror which struck like a thunderbolt from the uplifted hand of the Almighty.

Is it not that we are propagating a Christianity which is half paralyzed in its two chief forces of hope and fear through the perversions of a corrupted theology? We fail in thoroughly presenting God's love to the nations, a love strong enough to melt even Chinese arrogance, and to develop the belief of a personal God even among Chinese atheists, because we have encumbered Christianity with a doctrine of hell, so unjust, so indiscriminate, so hardening in its frightful propositions, that men's consciences refuse to receive it. Missionary theology cannot "commend itself to every man's conscience," because every man's conscience, whether in Europe or Asia, in proportion as it is enlightened, rejects it with horror. This is doubtless one principal reason for the general rejection of the gospel by the Brahmins, Bhuddists, and Confucianists of the East. God's love is hidden from them, and they "turn away sorrowful" from so direful a Christianity. Sir John Bowring says, in his work on Siam, that he never yet met with a learned Bhuddist who could speak with patience of the doctrine of the missionaries on the hell of England and America. Now whatever the better sort of thinking

men of any nation generally reject, will not be widely received by the uneducated.

III. But the prevailing system of teaching among missionaries fails also in another department—fails through withholding the influence of a truth favorable to the production alike of hope and of fear. Not only does the hell preached by the missionaries fail by its unscriptural representations to awaken terror in the educated classes, since whatever you exaggerate you weaken, but it is nearly everywhere the custom with missionary societies to send out men opposed to the belief of Christ's advent to judge the nations at the destruction of the Apostasy. The plain doctrine of Paul, in the second letter to the Thessalonians, that the personal advent of Christ will occur for the purpose of destroying "the man of sin;" the plain doctrine of the prophets that the "Son of man comes in the clouds of heaven" for the destruction of the "fourth" empire, and of the "horn that has eyes, and a mouth speaking marvelous things;" the plain doctrine that Christ will come to punish "with flaming fire" a church that has perverted Christianity until men can no longer believe in it, and to judge nations that persist in idolatry after due summons to repentance—this doctrine of Christ's "pre-millennial" advent, under the influence and expectation of which the gospel was indisputably spread in the first century, is systematically exploded and denied by the missionary societies, and the generality of missionaries. And here is a loss of power which may be readily appreciated. Let the gospel be preached in India and China as the message of life to the dead, as the promise of immortality in body and soul to a race sitting in darkness and death shade; let it be preached as the message of a God who is intelligibly loving, and intelligibly and justly severe; let it be preached that the "times of ignorance a gracious God winked at," *overlooked*, "but now commands all men everywhere to repent; let the words of the angel of the everlasting gospel, in the Apocalypse, become the text of missionary preaching, "Fear God, and give glory to him, *for the hour of his judgment is come!*" and one cannot but believe that a new power will attend in the East the proclamation of Christianity. There is something so striking, so fitted to compel attention, in the warning of Christ's speedy advent to "judge the nations," to destroy obstinate worshipers of idols, to avenge the rejection of the truth, to raise the dead saints, and to establish

UMI

"God's kingdom" on earth, that even languid India must lift its head to listen, and haughty philosophic China must listen awe-struck to the trumpet-blast. Christianity is a power which is designed to operate on man from before as well as from behind, through the expectation of events which shortly "shall come to pass," in the future, as well as through the study of facts accomplished in a remote past. It is emphatically a prophecy, as well as a history. But, under the prevalent system of missionary teaching, it is a gospel without that advent of Christ, the prospect of which filled and reddened like a dawn of glory at the beginning all the eastern sky. The whole body of prophecy is supposed now to prove only that "the Lord delayeth his coming," that wisdom consists in proclaiming the doctrine of the "evil servant," and in relegating all concern for the Lord's return in the clouds of heaven to a generation that shall live at the end of the Millennium. Vain, then, are all such warnings as, "Behold, he cometh in clouds, and every eye shall see him!" for it is well understood that such an expectation of the Lord is peculiar to the "weaker brethren," and to spirits in which fancy takes the place of faith. Thus it happens that Christ's advent is banished from the thoughts of nearly the whole body of missionaries. "*Far off his coming shines*" to them, indeed, as a remote, dim nebula in the firmament of the future. Who can wonder that a Christianity so destitute of forces to win, to convince, or to appal, maintains a doubtful fight with the stiffnecked pagans of Asia! What is wanted is a doctrine that commends itself to the reason and to the conscience of men—a love so real as to win all hearts capable of love, a terror so real, so near, and so appreciably equitable, as to shake, if it cannot vanquish, the stoutest resistance of the heathen. What is needed, is a hope of speedy victory to the church sufficient to restore the energies of the first century, and a courage founded on conviction which would engage in close conflict with the wretched positivism of Confucius. That "throneless king," as the Chinese call him, would soon, I reckon, lose such of his remaining power, before a CHRIST preached as if he were the very Jesus of the Gospels —"coming again," to be the "life" of the world.

With all reverence and affection, therefore, but with an earnestness which neutralizes the remembrance of personal insignificance, I implore my fellow-Christians at home to reconsider in the light of Scripture the doctrinal basis and method of the missionary enterprise. I adjure, before Christ our Lord, the Secretaries and Directors of the Missionary Societies, not to continue the ban now disingenuously placed upon those who openly deny what so few in secret perfectly believe. I solemnly call upon all the ministers of Christ who are persuaded of the untruth of the common doctrine on immortality and retribution, publicly to say so, and to confess their real convictions to the people. I earnestly invite all missionary students in the colleges to study these questions in earnest, and not to add to the number of those who carry out to the heathen a creed which they dare not proclaim to the cultured and intelligent people of India and China.

And finally, if my voice could, by a divine providence, reach so far, I would call, with profound respect, but equal boldness, upon every honored missionary of the Cross around the world, to cast aside the fear of brethren abroad, or churches or directors at home, and to apply his mind, if he have failed so to do up to this present hour, to the consideration of that doctrine of LIFE IN CHRIST which is the plain and natural reading of St. John's Gospel, St. Paul's Epistles; and next, to that doctrine of Christ's ADVENT TO JUDGMENT, which has won the conviction, in modern times, of a Bengel, a Stier, and an Alford, and a thousand more, and was unquestionably the belief of the apostles and their followers in the first age of the Christian revelation.—*Rev. Edward White, in Rainbow for July*, 1869.

THE SECOND ADVENT—ITS NATURE—TIME—AND PRACTICAL BEARING.

"A more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed." (2 Pet. 1: 19.)
"This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.)
"All Scripture is profitable for righteousness." (2 Tim. 3: 16.)

Not only are the truths revealed in the Bible the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but they are designed for our spiritual good. It is through the truth that we are sanctified. Error is always injurious in its tendency. All Scripture is profitable. There is nothing contained in these divine oracles which may not be made available to our spiritual welfare. Some truths are of a more decidedly practical nature than others; but all are to be received and studied, that they may produce their legitimate results, in moulding moral character, and fitting us the better for duty here, and for the experience and enjoyment of what is

"God's kingdom" on earth, that even languid India must lift its head to listen, and haughty philosophic China must listen awe-struck to the trumpet-blast. Christianity is a power which is designed to operate on man from before as well as from behind, through the expectation of events which shortly "shall come to pass," in the future, as well as through the study of facts accomplished in a remote past. It is emphatically a prophecy, as well as a history. But, under the prevalent system of missionary teaching, it is a gospel without that advent of Christ, the prospect of which filled and reddened like a dawn of glory at the beginning all the eastern sky. The whole body of prophecy is supposed now to prove only that "the Lord delayeth his coming," that wisdom consists in proclaiming the doctrine of the "evil servant," and in relegating all concern for the Lord's return in the clouds of heaven to a generation that shall live at the end of the Millennium. Vain, then, are all such warnings as, "Behold, he cometh in clouds, and every eye shall see him!" for it is well understood that such an expectation of the Lord is peculiar to the "weaker brethren," and to spirits in which fancy takes the place of faith. Thus it happens that Christ's advent is banished from the thoughts of nearly the whole body of missionaries. "*Far off his coming shines*" to them, indeed, as a remote, dim nebula in the firmament of the future. Who can wonder that a Christianity so destitute of forces to win, to convince, or to appal, maintains a doubtful fight with the stiffnecked pagans of Asia! What is wanted is a doctrine that commends itself to the reason and to the conscience of men—a love so real as to win all hearts capable of love, a terror so real, so near, and so appreciably equitable, as to shake, if it cannot vanquish, the stoutest resistance of the heathen. What is needed, is a hope of speedy victory to the church sufficient to restore the energies of the first century, and a courage founded on conviction which would engage in close conflict with the wretched positivism of Confucius. That "throneless king," as the Chinese call him, would soon, I reckon, lose such of his remaining power, before a CHRIST preached as if he were the very Jesus of the Gospels —"coming again," to be the "life" of the world.

With all reverence and affection, therefore, but with an earnestness which neutralizes the remembrance of personal insignificance, I implore my fellow-Christians at home to reconsider in the light of Scripture the doctrinal basis and method of the missionary enterprise. I adjure, before Christ our Lord, the Secretaries and Directors of the Missionary Societies, not to continue the ban now disingenuously placed upon those who openly deny what so few in secret perfectly believe. I solemnly call upon all the ministers of Christ who are persuaded of the untruth of the common doctrine on immortality and retribution, publicly to say so, and to confess their real convictions to the people. I earnestly invite all missionary students in the colleges to study these questions in earnest, and not to add to the number of those who carry out to the heathen a creed which they dare not proclaim to the cultured and intelligent people of India and China.

And finally, if my voice could, by a divine providence, reach so far, I would call, with profound respect, but equal boldness, upon every honored missionary of the Cross around the world, to cast aside the fear of brethren abroad, or churches or directors at home, and to apply his mind, if he have failed so to do up to this present hour, to the consideration of that doctrine of LIFE IN CHRIST which is the plain and natural reading of St. John's Gospel, St. Paul's Epistles; and next, to that doctrine of Christ's ADVENT TO JUDGMENT, which has won the conviction, in modern times, of a Bengel, a Stier, and an Alford, and a thousand more, and was unquestionably the belief of the apostles and their followers in the first age of the Christian revelation.—*Rev. Edward White, in Rainbow for July*, 1869.

THE SECOND ADVENT—ITS NATURE—TIME—AND PRACTICAL BEARING.

"A more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed." (2 Pet. 1: 19.)
"This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.)
"All Scripture is profitable for righteousness." (2 Tim. 3: 16.)

Not only are the truths revealed in the Bible the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but they are designed for our spiritual good. It is through the truth that we are sanctified. Error is always injurious in its tendency. All Scripture is profitable. There is nothing contained in these divine oracles which may not be made available to our spiritual welfare. Some truths are of a more decidedly practical nature than others; but all are to be received and studied, that they may produce their legitimate results, in moulding moral character, and fitting us the better for duty here, and for the experience and enjoyment of what is

to be revealed hereafter. Mere speculation or conjecture can be of but little profit. Much time may be spent in endeavoring to unravel mysteries; much in striving to comprehend or discover what lies beyond the reach of our comprehension, or what is not properly within the range of our investigation, and which cannot be discovered, because it has not been revealed. All such time and effort are vainly expended. There is much in the future hidden from our view; and it is not for man to strive to penetrate, or to uplift the veil which shuts out from vision these unrevealed portions of God's wise and wondrous plan. Patiently must we wait for their revelation, as he shall unfold and develop his purposes, more and more clearly, for the admiration and blessedness of his Church. There are, however, things pertaining to the future, which the Lord has been pleased clearly to make known. Prophecy is a prominent feature of the Bible record, and it is given to us for our edification and study. Much of the prophetic Scriptures has already met with its literal fulfillment, and much remains yet to be fulfilled; while each day, as it passes by, presents us with predictions in the actual process of accomplishment.

Prophecy, already fulfilled, confirms our confidence in the truthfulness of the Scriptures and in the faithfulness of God. It is a standing proof of the truth of the religion of the Bible, which infidelity vainly strives to gainsay, or to successfully resist; and it is the assurance, moreover, that what remains unfulfilled will as certainly be verified. But is the study of unfulfilled prophecy a profitable study? Is it a subject of legitimate investigation? May we not be benefitted by what is already accomplished, and leave what is future without special inquiry or care, and especially so because of the conflicting views of professed interpreters in regard to many of these predictions? So some reason, and so some regulate their course, persuading themselves that the study of what is not fulfilled is not for edification or instruction. This is not, however, in accordance with the Spirit, or the teachings of the word of God; for *all* Scripture is not only given by inspiration, but is also "profitable."

The prophets, in former days, carefully studied the predictions they were bidden themselves to deliver. "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." (1 Pet. 1: 10, 11.) If they were thus employed, wishing to understand the import of their own words, surely the prayerful examination of what the Lord declares to be yet in reserve for the world and the Church is not only a duty but a privilege; inasmuch as scenes far more glorious and startling than have ever transpired on earth are before us, and it may be not far removed. A special blessing is pro-

to be revealed hereafter. Mere speculation or conjecture can be of but little profit. Much time may be spent in endeavoring to unravel mysteries; much in striving to comprehend or discover what lies beyond the reach of our comprehension, or what is not properly within the range of our investigation, and which cannot be discovered, because it has not been revealed. All such time and effort are vainly expended. There is much in the future hidden from our view; and it is not for man to strive to penetrate, or to uplift the veil which shuts out from vision these unrevealed portions of God's wise and wondrous plan. Patiently must we wait for their revelation, as he shall unfold and develop his purposes, more and more clearly, for the admiration and blessedness of his Church. There are, however, things pertaining to the future, which the Lord has been pleased clearly to make known. Prophecy is a prominent feature of the Bible record, and it is given to us for our edification and study. Much of the prophetic Scriptures has already met with its literal fulfillment, and much remains yet to be fulfilled; while each day, as it passes by, presents us with predictions in the actual process of accomplishment.

Prophecy, already fulfilled, confirms our confidence in the truthfulness of the Scriptures and in the faithfulness of God. It is a standing proof of the truth of the religion of the Bible, which infidelity vainly strives to gainsay, or to successfully resist; and it is the assurance, moreover, that what remains unfulfilled will as certainly be verified. But is the study of unfulfilled prophecy a profitable study? Is it a subject of legitimate investigation? May we not be benefitted by what is already accomplished, and leave what is future without special inquiry or care, and especially so because of the conflicting views of professed interpreters in regard to many of these predictions? So some reason, and so some regulate their course, persuading themselves that the study of what is not fulfilled is not for edification or instruction. This is not, however, in accordance with the Spirit, or the teachings of the word of God; for *all* Scripture is not only given by inspiration, but is also "profitable."

The prophets, in former days, carefully studied the predictions they were bidden themselves to deliver. "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." (1 Pet. 1: 10, 11.) If they were thus employed, wishing to understand the import of their own words, surely the prayerful examination of what the Lord declares to be yet in reserve for the world and the Church is not only a duty but a privilege; inasmuch as scenes far more glorious and startling than have ever transpired on earth are before us, and it may be not far removed. A special blessing is pro-

PAGE(S) MISSING

UMI

PAGE(S) MISSING

UMI

nounced on those who make these coming events the subject of inquiry. The volume of inspiration closes with the most extended and intricate portion of the prophetic writings; and at the very opening of the "Revelation" we hear the inspired Apostle saying, as it were in anticipation of any objection to the study which might be raised, and for the encouragement of the inquirer: "*Blessed* is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand." (Rev. 1: 3.) Thus would the Spirit of the Lord lead us to examine those things of the future which have been made the subjects of revelation. It is to be done with a docile, prayerful, unprejudiced spirit, if we would secure the promised blessedness.

Prominent amid the subjects of inquiry is that of the SECOND COMING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Our object is to consider it: (1) IN ITS NATURE; (2) IN ITS TIME; AND (3) IN ITS PRACTICAL BEARINGS.

I. AS TO ITS NATURE.

There is a spiritual coming of Christ spoken of in the Scriptures. Said the Savior, "If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John 14: 23.) "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. 3: 20.) This is, unquestionably, a spiritual coming, and it is one in which every regenerated soul has a special interest. So may there be said to be a *providential* coming of Jesus. Every providence that affects our weal or woe—every startling incident of life may, in a sense, be said to be the coming of him whose ordering it is. So the solemn warning to the church at Sardis; "If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." (Rev. 3: 3.) But these, the spiritual and providential comings of Christ, are not what are meant by the emphatic and repeated assurances of the "coming of the Son of man."

The prophets of old, in glorious strains, spoke of the advent of the Messiah—Israel's Prince and Deliverer. And ardent were the anticipations which these animating predictions awakened. The character of the predicted one was twofold. He was described by Isaiah as a suffering victim of bitter persecution—"a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; despised and rejected of men." He was also described as a ruling Prince, a gloriously exalted King upon his throne, whose kingdom should extend over the earth, and whose dominion should know no end. There was to be given unto him, as Daniel declares, "dominion, glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Thus the range of the prophet's vision em-

nounced on those who make these coming events the subject of inquiry. The volume of inspiration closes with the most extended and intricate portion of the prophetic writings; and at the very opening of the "Revelation" we hear the inspired Apostle saying, as it were in anticipation of any objection to the study which might be raised, and for the encouragement of the inquirer: "*Blessed* is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand." (Rev. 1: 3.) Thus would the Spirit of the Lord lead us to examine those things of the future which have been made the subjects of revelation. It is to be done with a docile, prayerful, unprejudiced spirit, if we would secure the promised blessedness.

Prominent amid the subjects of inquiry is that of the SECOND COMING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Our object is to consider it: (1) IN ITS NATURE; (2) IN ITS TIME; AND (3) IN ITS PRACTICAL BEARINGS.

I. AS TO ITS NATURE.

There is a spiritual coming of Christ spoken of in the Scriptures. Said the Savior, "If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John 14: 23.) "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. 3: 20.) This is, unquestionably, a spiritual coming, and it is one in which every regenerated soul has a special interest. So may there be said to be a *providential* coming of Jesus. Every providence that affects our weal or woe—every startling incident of life may, in a sense, be said to be the coming of him whose ordering it is. So the solemn warning to the church at Sardis; "If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." (Rev. 3: 3.) But these, the spiritual and providential comings of Christ, are not what are meant by the emphatic and repeated assurances of the "coming of the Son of man."

The prophets of old, in glorious strains, spoke of the advent of the Messiah—Israel's Prince and Deliverer. And ardent were the anticipations which these animating predictions awakened. The character of the predicted one was twofold. He was described by Isaiah as a suffering victim of bitter persecution—"a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; despised and rejected of men." He was also described as a ruling Prince, a gloriously exalted King upon his throne, whose kingdom should extend over the earth, and whose dominion should know no end. There was to be given unto him, as Daniel declares, "dominion, glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Thus the range of the prophet's vision em-

braced more than the advent of Christ eighteen hundred years since, when as the helpless babe, at Bethlehem, he appeared the incarnate One who came on his mission of mercy to our perishing race; and when, as man's atoning sacrifice, he hung, a murdered Nazarene, upon the cross. This was his state of humiliation and of suffering; and was the verification of only a part of the prediction. That prediction extended onward for many centuries, and embraced a *second* coming, when should be realized the visions of a glorious Prince in possession of a dominion and a kingdom over all people, and nations, and languages—a dominion that was to be everlasting, and a kingdom "without end." The prophecy had respect to a reigning Prince, as well as to a suffering victim. As one part of the prediction did not mean a spiritual coming, but a personal, literal advent to suffer and to die, so neither does the other—or that yet waiting its fulfillment, which regards him as a ruling Prince on earth—admit of a spiritual or figurative interpretation. It is to be a visible, personal advent, as certainly as was that when eastern Magi offered their gifts in the lowly abode at Bethlehem; or when the diseased and demon-possessed of Jerusalem knew his healing power; or when scoffing priests reviled the sufferer on the cross; or when wondering disciples saw him pass from their vision, as they gazed up from Olivet into the opened heavens. "This same Jesus which is taken from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." So spake the angels to the disciples, and their words will assuredly be verified. He was *seen* to go into heaven, and so will he be *seen* to come again. "This *same* Jesus;" and in *like manner* as he *went* will he *return*. Here can be nothing less than a personal, visible advent. Nor are the words to wait for their literal fulfillment until the Millennium be passed.

It may be a matter of some interest to note the *manner* in which the Scriptures are wont to speak of the second advent of Christ. This will give us additional proof that such advent cannot be a spiritual or a figurative coming. This coming is represented by at least twelve different words or expressions, and these occur about one hundred and twenty-five times in undoubted reference to this great event. The import of three of these words would seem to settle the question touching the nature of the advent of the Redeemer. The first is a word which gives the title to the last book of the Scriptures, "The Revelation," sometimes called the Apocalypse of Christ—the Greek word *apokalupsis*, meaning revelation or manifestation. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ" is the beginning and the title of the book, because his personal coming, the revelation or manifestation of himself, is its grand, prominent subject.[1] The word occurs in 1 Cor. 1: 7, "waiting for the coming [the revelation, as the original is] of Jesus Christ." "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from

[1] W. Newton.

heaven." (2 Thess. 1: 7.) "At the appearing [revelation] of Jesus Christ." "Hope for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 1: 7, 13.) A second word is *epiphania*, and means appearance—personal appearance. It occurs in 2 Tim. 1: 10, in reference to the first coming of our Lord in the flesh, and in 1 Tim. 6: 14, to his second coming, "until the appearing [*epiphania*] of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom," "unto all them that love his *appearing*." (2 Tim. 4: 1, 8.) "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious *appearing* of the Great God and (even) of our Savior Jesus Christ." (Tit. 2: 13.) The third word used is *parousia*, which embraces always the idea of personal presence, "arrival." (Donnegan.) It is found four times in Matt. 24, in reference to the second advent of Christ. "What shall be the sign of thy *coming* [*parousia*]?" "So shall the *coming* [*parousia*] of the Son of man be." "As the days of Noah were, so shall the *coming* [*parousia*] of the Son of man be." St. Paul thus uses the word: "They that are Christ's at his *coming*." (1 Cor. 15: 23.) "Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his *coming*." (1 Thess. 2: 19.) "At the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." (1 Thess. 3: 13.) "We which are alive and remain unto the *coming* of the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 15.) Such are some of the passages where these words are used. In other places we find them in reference to *other* objects or persons, but never to denote a spiritual or figurative revelation or appearance or advent or presence. Always where it is an object of sense, a literal, personal, visible appearance is meant.

Thus nothing, surely, is more clearly revealed than the visible second coming of the Son of man to this very earth. On almost any page of the Bible is there reference, more or less direct, to it. It runs through the New Testament, as a golden thread, giving significancy and interest to every part, as it falls from the lips of the divine teacher, or as it is spread out upon the pages of the epistles of the inspired apostles to the several Churches they addressed.

II. But, WHAT IS TO BE THE TIME OF HIS ADVENT? This is our *second* inquiry.

In the second epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, mention is made of "the man of sin," or the "anti-Christ," whose destruction is to be effected by the "brightness of the Lord's coming." It so happens that the *brightness* and the *coming* of this passage are, in the original, two of the words just referred to, each of which expresses the *personal appearance* of him whose coming is spoken of. If neither of them when used singly can denote a spiritual advent, much less can they when conjoined; and if each of these, when employed separately, indubitably, means a *personal* and *corporeal* manifestation and presence, much more must they when united. The destruction of anti-Christ then is

braced more than the advent of Christ eighteen hundred years since, when as the helpless babe, at Bethlehem, he appeared the incarnate One who came on his mission of mercy to our perishing race; and when, as man's atoning sacrifice, he hung, a murdered Nazarene, upon the cross. This was his state of humiliation and of suffering; and was the verification of only a part of the prediction. That prediction extended onward for many centuries, and embraced a *second* coming, when should be realized the visions of a glorious Prince in possession of a dominion and a kingdom over all people, and nations, and languages—a dominion that was to be everlasting, and a kingdom "without end." The prophecy had respect to a reigning Prince, as well as to a suffering victim. As one part of the prediction did not mean a spiritual coming, but a personal, literal advent to suffer and to die, so neither does the other—or that yet waiting its fulfillment, which regards him as a ruling Prince on earth—admit of a spiritual or figurative interpretation. It is to be a visible, personal advent, as certainly as was that when eastern Magi offered their gifts in the lowly abode at Bethlehem; or when the diseased and demon-possessed of Jerusalem knew his healing power; or when scoffing priests reviled the sufferer on the cross; or when wondering disciples saw him pass from their vision, as they gazed up from Olivet into the opened heavens. "This same Jesus which is taken from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." So spake the angels to the disciples, and their words will assuredly be verified. He was *seen* to go into heaven, and so will he be *seen* to come again. "This *same* Jesus;" and in *like manner* as he *went* will he *return*. Here can be nothing less than a personal, visible advent. Nor are the words to wait for their literal fulfillment until the Millennium be passed.

It may be a matter of some interest to note the *manner* in which the Scriptures are wont to speak of the second advent of Christ. This will give us additional proof that such advent cannot be a spiritual or a figurative coming. This coming is represented by at least twelve different words or expressions, and these occur about one hundred and twenty-five times in undoubted reference to this great event. The import of three of these words would seem to settle the question touching the nature of the advent of the Redeemer. The first is a word which gives the title to the last book of the Scriptures, "The Revelation," sometimes called the Apocalypse of Christ—the Greek word *apokalupsis*, meaning revelation or manifestation. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ" is the beginning and the title of the book, because his personal coming, the revelation or manifestation of himself, is its grand, prominent subject.[1] The word occurs in 1 Cor. 1: 7, "waiting for the coming [the revelation, as the original is] of Jesus Christ." "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from

[1] W. Newton.

heaven." (2 Thess. 1: 7.) "At the appearing [revelation] of Jesus Christ." "Hope for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 1: 7, 13.) A second word is *epiphania*, and means appearance—personal appearance. It occurs in 2 Tim. 1: 10, in reference to the first coming of our Lord in the flesh, and in 1 Tim. 6: 14, to his second coming, "until the appearing [*epiphania*] of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom," "unto all them that love his *appearing*." (2 Tim. 4: 1, 8.) "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious *appearing* of the Great God and (even) of our Savior Jesus Christ." (Tit. 2: 13.) The third word used is *parousia*, which embraces always the idea of personal presence, "arrival." (Donnegan.) It is found four times in Matt. 24, in reference to the second advent of Christ. "What shall be the sign of thy *coming* [*parousia*]?" "So shall the *coming* [*parousia*] of the Son of man be." "As the days of Noah were, so shall the *coming* [*parousia*] of the Son of man be." St. Paul thus uses the word: "They that are Christ's at his *coming*." (1 Cor. 15: 23.) "Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his *coming*." (1 Thess. 2: 19.) "At the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." (1 Thess. 3: 13.) "We which are alive and remain unto the *coming* of the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 15.) Such are some of the passages where these words are used. In other places we find them in reference to *other* objects or persons, but never to denote a spiritual or figurative revelation or appearance or advent or presence. Always where it is an object of sense, a literal, personal, visible appearance is meant.

Thus nothing, surely, is more clearly revealed than the visible second coming of the Son of man to this very earth. On almost any page of the Bible is there reference, more or less direct, to it. It runs through the New Testament, as a golden thread, giving significancy and interest to every part, as it falls from the lips of the divine teacher, or as it is spread out upon the pages of the epistles of the inspired apostles to the several Churches they addressed.

II. But, WHAT IS TO BE THE TIME OF HIS ADVENT? This is our *second* inquiry.

In the second epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, mention is made of "the man of sin," or the "anti-Christ," whose destruction is to be effected by the "brightness of the Lord's coming." It so happens that the *brightness* and the *coming* of this passage are, in the original, two of the words just referred to, each of which expresses the *personal appearance* of him whose coming is spoken of. If neither of them when used singly can denote a spiritual advent, much less can they when conjoined; and if each of these, when employed separately, indubitably, means a *personal* and *corporeal* manifestation and presence, much more must they when united. The destruction of anti-Christ then is

not to be a spiritual destruction, nor to be accomplished by any mere spiritual manifestation of his Destroyer. But his is to be a literal overthrow, effected by the brightness of the coming, or by the "appearance of the presence" of the Son of God in judgment on his enemies. There is also mention made in the same place of the "mystery of iniquity," which was already working at the time Paul wrote his epistle. This "mystery," having its rudiments even in apostolic times, became under the development of subsequent ages, in its full manifestation, the formidable despotism which overshadowed Christendom, and was known as the all-controlling power whose seat was on the seven hills. It was the "scarlet-clad woman," "the mother of abominations," the Romish hierarchy. Now are "anti-Christ," the formidable "man of sin," and this power, impiously assuming the name of Christianity and the prerogatives of Christ—this gigantic evil—this grand antagonistic system of Satanic origin—to continue, as we have inquired once before, through the Millennium, and onward to a distant period—then to be destroyed at the predicted advent of the Lord Jesus, as he comes to judgment and to a world's annihilation? If not, then must that advent be before the Millennium. Both are to be destroyed at the "revelation" of the Son of God.

The same truth is revealed in the seventh of Daniel We are, moreover, taught, as has already been seen, that Satan is the "god of this world," or the god of this period (*aion*)—or present dispensation; and here will he continue, by divine permission, to have the pre-eminence until the time shall have come for his being bound and cast into the abyss, previous to which the tares and the wheat are to remain intermingled, until the "harvest," which is the end of the world (*aion*)—the present dispensation or age, and then the Son of man shall come to make the grand separation, and to destroy the wicked, and to establish his kingdom. The Gospel of the kingdom is to be preached "for *a witness* unto all nations," in order that the Lord may take *out of them*—or out from among them—his elect people—"a people for his name;" and that every nation may have an opportunity to say whether or not they will yield to the dominion of the Prince of righteousness.

Thus is the present period a period of suspended judgments—one of forbearance toward the guilty nations of the earth. But when the angel, bearing the everlasting Gospel, shall have accomplished his circuit of the globe, the time of forbearance shall cease—"the end shall come." "And *then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and *they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven*, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. 24: 30, 31.)

But the question as to the TIME OF THE SECOND ADVENT admits of, and seems to demand, a more definite answer; and we may consider, (1) *The relative period;* (2) *The specific or chronological time.*

Whatever may be thought and said by some of the presumption of those who venture to specify a particular "hour or day," or even year, wherein the Lord shall appear, we are, assuredly, warranted, yea, it is our enjoined *duty* so to consider the "signs" of his coming as at least to judge of our *proximate* nearness to the event; else the injunction is without meaning. "When these things [these signs just enumerated by the Savior] begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your *redemption draweth nigh.*" (Luke 21: 28.)

Various "signs" are specified, by which we are to judge of the near approach of the predicted period. And, if careful observers and attentive students are not greatly at fault in their calculations, based on these "signs," the time is near at hand, when a heedless world and a slumbering Church will be startled from their apathy by the cry: "*Behold! the Bridegroom cometh. Go ye out to meet him.*" We are taught that these "signs" will be so clear a demonstration of the immediate coming and kingdom of Christ, that we can know his coming is at hand, just as we know that summer is nigh when the trees begin to put forth leaves. (Luke 21: 30; Matt. 24: 33.) We are not only taught to believe that we *can* know it, but we are as positively commanded to know it as we are to believe that Jesus is the Son of God. (Matt. 24: 33; Mark 13: 29; Luke 21: 28, 31.) Among these "signs" immediately to precede this glorious event—the coming of our Lord—and by which we are to judge of its proximate nearness are:

1. *The Gospel is to be preached to all nations of the earth* "FOR A WITNESS." "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Matt. 24: 14; Acts 1: 8.)

2. *A general apostasy from the faith in nominal Christendom.* "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" (Luke 18: 8; 2 Thess. 2: 3; 2 Tim. 3: 1, 5; 4: 3, 4, &c.)

3. *A great prevalence of iniquity in the world.* "As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Matt. 24: 37; 2 Thess. 2: 11; 2 Tim. 3: 13; Jude 17–19, &c.)

4. *National and political revolutions and great disturbances.* "There shall be upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and waves thereof roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory." (Luke 21: 25–27; Heb. 12: 27; Rev. 8: 1–13; Is. 2: 10–22, &c.)

not to be a spiritual destruction, nor to be accomplished by any mere spiritual manifestation of his Destroyer. But his is to be a literal overthrow, effected by the brightness of the coming, or by the "appearance of the presence" of the Son of God in judgment on his enemies. There is also mention made in the same place of the "mystery of iniquity," which was already working at the time Paul wrote his epistle. This "mystery," having its rudiments even in apostolic times, became under the development of subsequent ages, in its full manifestation, the formidable despotism which overshadowed Christendom, and was known as the all-controlling power whose seat was on the seven hills. It was the "scarlet-clad woman," "the mother of abominations," the Romish hierarchy. Now are "anti-Christ," the formidable "man of sin," and this power, impiously assuming the name of Christianity and the prerogatives of Christ—this gigantic evil—this grand antagonistic system of Satanic origin—to continue, as we have inquired once before, through the Millennium, and onward to a distant period—then to be destroyed at the predicted advent of the Lord Jesus, as he comes to judgment and to a world's annihilation? If not, then must that advent be before the Millennium. Both are to be destroyed at the "revelation" of the Son of God.

The same truth is revealed in the seventh of Daniel We are, moreover, taught, as has already been seen, that Satan is the "god of this world," or the god of this period (*aion*)—or present dispensation; and here will he continue, by divine permission, to have the pre-eminence until the time shall have come for his being bound and cast into the abyss, previous to which the tares and the wheat are to remain intermingled, until the "harvest," which is the end of the world (*aion*)—the present dispensation or age, and then the Son of man shall come to make the grand separation, and to destroy the wicked, and to establish his kingdom. The Gospel of the kingdom is to be preached "for *a witness* unto all nations," in order that the Lord may take *out of them*—or out from among them—his elect people—"a people for his name;" and that every nation may have an opportunity to say whether or not they will yield to the dominion of the Prince of righteousness.

Thus is the present period a period of suspended judgments—one of forbearance toward the guilty nations of the earth. But when the angel, bearing the everlasting Gospel, shall have accomplished his circuit of the globe, the time of forbearance shall cease—"the end shall come." "And *then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and *they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven*, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. 24: 30, 31.)

But the question as to the TIME OF THE SECOND ADVENT admits of, and seems to demand, a more definite answer; and we may consider, (1) *The relative period;* (2) *The specific or chronological time.*

Whatever may be thought and said by some of the presumption of those who venture to specify a particular "hour or day," or even year, wherein the Lord shall appear, we are, assuredly, warranted, yea, it is our enjoined *duty* so to consider the "signs" of his coming as at least to judge of our *proximate* nearness to the event; else the injunction is without meaning. "When these things [these signs just enumerated by the Savior] begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your *redemption draweth nigh.*" (Luke 21: 28.)

Various "signs" are specified, by which we are to judge of the near approach of the predicted period. And, if careful observers and attentive students are not greatly at fault in their calculations, based on these "signs," the time is near at hand, when a heedless world and a slumbering Church will be startled from their apathy by the cry: "*Behold! the Bridegroom cometh. Go ye out to meet him.*" We are taught that these "signs" will be so clear a demonstration of the immediate coming and kingdom of Christ, that we can know his coming is at hand, just as we know that summer is nigh when the trees begin to put forth leaves. (Luke 21: 30; Matt. 24: 33.) We are not only taught to believe that we *can* know it, but we are as positively commanded to know it as we are to believe that Jesus is the Son of God. (Matt. 24: 33; Mark 13: 29; Luke 21: 28, 31.) Among these "signs" immediately to precede this glorious event—the coming of our Lord—and by which we are to judge of its proximate nearness are:

1. *The Gospel is to be preached to all nations of the earth* "FOR A WITNESS." "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Matt. 24: 14; Acts 1: 8.)

2. *A general apostasy from the faith in nominal Christendom.* "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" (Luke 18: 8; 2 Thess. 2: 3; 2 Tim. 3: 1, 5; 4: 3, 4, &c.)

3. *A great prevalence of iniquity in the world.* "As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Matt. 24: 37; 2 Thess. 2: 11; 2 Tim. 3: 13; Jude 17–19, &c.)

4. *National and political revolutions and great disturbances.* "There shall be upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and waves thereof roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory." (Luke 21: 25–27; Heb. 12: 27; Rev. 8: 1–13; Is. 2: 10–22, &c.)

5. *Numerous unusual physical phenomena, and portentous forebodings of nature.* "Great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon earth distress of nations. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud." (Luke 21: 11, 25, 27; Acts 2: 19, 20; Mic. 7: 15, 16.)

6. *An unusual awakening of interest and inquiry among the true followers of Christ respecting his second coming.* "At midnight there was a cry made. Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him." (Matt. 25: 6; Hab. 2: 1–3; Dan. 12: 4, 9.)

7. *Unprecedented manifestations of the power and malice of the devil in the Church and in the world.* "The devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." (Rev. 12: 12; Matt. 24: 24; 2 Thess. 2: 8, 12; 1 Tim. 4: 1, 3, &c.)

These and other signs are clearly indicated, and if we fail to look out for them, and to be influenced by them in our conclusions as to the approaching nearness of the grand event which they are designed immediately to anticipate, may we not meet with the displeasure of our Lord, and render ourselves obnoxious to the rebuke he administered to some of old: "O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" (Matt. 16: 3.)

But this opinion of the rapidly approaching period is not founded solely on "the signs" predicted; which leads us briefly to consider,

The specific (chronological) time of the Second Advent.

There are certain chronological predictions which have direct reference to this event; and which have not, surely, been given in order merely to awaken a curiosity never to be gratified, and to lead to vain and profitless speculation. If in ages past no satisfactory solution of these predicted times has been reached, *it is but the fulfillment of prophecy.* A celestial messenger said to Daniel (ch. 10: 14), "I am come to make thee understand what shall *befall thy people in the latter days.*" In the twelfth chapter we read, "O Daniel, *shut up* the words and *seal the book even to the time of the end.*" And again: "Then said I, O my Lord! what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed *till the time of the end*.....And none of the wicked shall understand, *but the wise shall understand.*" Thus are we informed that a time would come when, howsoever obscure and unintelligible to the wicked these predictions should be, "*the wise should understand them*;" for "at the time of the end" are these seals to be broken and the words understood. And we ask, Who will say that the "time of the end" may not now have come? Within these thirty or forty years much attention has been given to the investigation of

these "signs" of the times, and to the study of the chronological prophecies, and these investigations have been conducted by some of the most sober-minded, the most learned, and the most godly of the Church; and it is a very noteworthy fact that, with scarcely a single exception, the conclusion is reached, that within a few years, three, or five, or ten, these predicted events will transpire, or begin to be verified. All the lines of prophetic interpretation, the result of independent and of varied methods of investigation, seem most remarkably to converge to these very years now just at hand. It is thought, and with many it is a conviction, that within the period specified, the long anticipated second coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, to glorify the saints, and to be glorified of them; to execute judgments upon his enemies; to establish his kingdom, will occur, or, at least, that "the beginning of the end" will be most manifest. In reference to any specific, definite time when these events will transpire, we wish to speak with caution. We have no opinion to express as the result of independent examination of the chronological prophecies. We refer to the conclusion which others have reached. A short time will test the correctness of these conclusions. They may prove fallacious. But those who entertain them think they have, after patient study, all-sufficient reasons for their belief. We do not give here the data on which their conclusions are founded, nor the varied investigations leading to them, but the simple result to which they have come, and this assuredly demands most serious consideration. For if it be legitimately reached, we are indeed standing on the very verge of that tremendous crisis, in which all the prophecies center in regard to the interests and the destinies both of the Church of God, and the nations of the earth, at the time of the great "harvest," at the end of the world, or the "times of the Gentiles."

We know that all attempts to fix definitely the time of these stupendous events is by many most strenuously opposed, and it is thought that there is decided scriptural warrant for the objection. Many of those who make it have no expectation of a literal kingdom with Christ, in person, the reigning Prince, *ever* being established here on earth. We have already noticed the intimation given to Daniel, that at "the time of the end" the seal of the book containing these mysteries should be broken, and the "wise should understand." We may now refer to some declarations of the Savior, which to many are the assurance that the time is not to be known by any until the event shall be actually upon us.

Jesus said to the inquiry of the disciples, "Wilt thou *at this time* restore again the kingdom to Israel?" "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." (Acts 1: 6, 7.)

It is of some importance here to note, that so far from this

UMI

5. *Numerous unusual physical phenomena, and portentous forebodings of nature.* "Great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon earth distress of nations. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud." (Luke 21: 11, 25, 27; Acts 2: 19, 20; Mic. 7: 15, 16.)

6. *An unusual awakening of interest and inquiry among the true followers of Christ respecting his second coming.* "At midnight there was a cry made. Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him." (Matt. 25: 6; Hab. 2: 1–3; Dan. 12: 4, 9.)

7. *Unprecedented manifestations of the power and malice of the devil in the Church and in the world.* "The devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." (Rev. 12: 12; Matt. 24: 24; 2 Thess. 2: 8, 12; 1 Tim. 4: 1, 3, &c.)

These and other signs are clearly indicated, and if we fail to look out for them, and to be influenced by them in our conclusions as to the approaching nearness of the grand event which they are designed immediately to anticipate, may we not meet with the displeasure of our Lord, and render ourselves obnoxious to the rebuke he administered to some of old: "O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" (Matt. 16: 3.)

But this opinion of the rapidly approaching period is not founded solely on "the signs" predicted; which leads us briefly to consider,

The specific (chronological) time of the Second Advent.

There are certain chronological predictions which have direct reference to this event; and which have not, surely, been given in order merely to awaken a curiosity never to be gratified, and to lead to vain and profitless speculation. If in ages past no satisfactory solution of these predicted times has been reached, *it is but the fulfillment of prophecy.* A celestial messenger said to Daniel (ch. 10: 14), "I am come to make thee understand what shall *befall thy people in the latter days.*" In the twelfth chapter we read, "O Daniel, *shut up* the words and *seal the book even to the time of the end.*" And again: "Then said I, O my Lord! what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed *till the time of the end*.....And none of the wicked shall understand, *but the wise shall understand.*" Thus are we informed that a time would come when, howsoever obscure and unintelligible to the wicked these predictions should be, "*the wise should understand them*;" for "at the time of the end" are these seals to be broken and the words understood. And we ask, Who will say that the "time of the end" may not now have come? Within these thirty or forty years much attention has been given to the investigation of

these "signs" of the times, and to the study of the chronological prophecies, and these investigations have been conducted by some of the most sober-minded, the most learned, and the most godly of the Church; and it is a very noteworthy fact that, with scarcely a single exception, the conclusion is reached, that within a few years, three, or five, or ten, these predicted events will transpire, or begin to be verified. All the lines of prophetic interpretation, the result of independent and of varied methods of investigation, seem most remarkably to converge to these very years now just at hand. It is thought, and with many it is a conviction, that within the period specified, the long anticipated second coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, to glorify the saints, and to be glorified of them; to execute judgments upon his enemies; to establish his kingdom, will occur, or, at least, that "the beginning of the end" will be most manifest. In reference to any specific, definite time when these events will transpire, we wish to speak with caution. We have no opinion to express as the result of independent examination of the chronological prophecies. We refer to the conclusion which others have reached. A short time will test the correctness of these conclusions. They may prove fallacious. But those who entertain them think they have, after patient study, all-sufficient reasons for their belief. We do not give here the data on which their conclusions are founded, nor the varied investigations leading to them, but the simple result to which they have come, and this assuredly demands most serious consideration. For if it be legitimately reached, we are indeed standing on the very verge of that tremendous crisis, in which all the prophecies center in regard to the interests and the destinies both of the Church of God, and the nations of the earth, at the time of the great "harvest," at the end of the world, or the "times of the Gentiles."

We know that all attempts to fix definitely the time of these stupendous events is by many most strenuously opposed, and it is thought that there is decided scriptural warrant for the objection. Many of those who make it have no expectation of a literal kingdom with Christ, in person, the reigning Prince, *ever* being established here on earth. We have already noticed the intimation given to Daniel, that at "the time of the end" the seal of the book containing these mysteries should be broken, and the "wise should understand." We may now refer to some declarations of the Savior, which to many are the assurance that the time is not to be known by any until the event shall be actually upon us.

Jesus said to the inquiry of the disciples, "Wilt thou *at this time* restore again the kingdom to Israel?" "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." (Acts 1: 6, 7.)

It is of some importance here to note, that so far from this

UMI

response being a denial of his purpose to establish that kingdom which they expected would be here on earth, with him as their Prince, it is a virtual admission that *it would be so established.* The Savior would only remind them that it was not for *them* to know the *time* when it should be done. It is not for *you* to know—*you* of this generation, and it may have embraced many subsequent generations. It was in the *Father's power.* But if *they* were not to know the time, it does not follow that a knowledge of that time was always to be withheld from prayerful inquirers. It was in the Father's power not only to establish the kingdom, but to make known, if so he should be pleased to do, the time when it should be done; and especially as the period should arrive when, according to Daniel, "the wise would be made to understand" the contents of the sealed book; and when the "signs" of the times should clearly indicate the near approach of the great event. We see not that the response of the Savior is to bar or to discourage inquiry on the subject.

A second passage, which to some appears to be even more conclusive, as to the futility and impropriety of endeavoring to ascertain the time of the second advent, is the declaration of Jesus to his disciples as recorded, Mark 13:32: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Not designing to make a special point of the fact that reference is here made not to the *year*, but to the *day* and *hour* of his coming, it is yet worthy of some note, inasmuch as the specific day and hour are not embraced in the calculation of any. But even if they were, we see not that this utterance of the Savior forbids the hope of ascertaining them, much less does it prohibit positively or by implication an endeavor by the study of chronological prophecy to discover what may be the *year*, proximately at least. Jesus declares that neither man nor angel, nor the Son of man "*knoweth*" the day and hour. And the truthfulness of the declaration no one may question. But who is the Son of man, and what is the date, and what were the circumstances of the utterance? The Son is the same one precisely, of whom it is said, he "*increased* in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man." (Luke 2:52.) The same one who was, undoubtedly, in ignorance of some things, and it may be even of the time of his second coming, until the hour of his death. Christ was possessed of a two-fold nature. How the human nature of Christ, in intimate union and sympathy with the divine, thus closely associated with Omniscience itself, could be limited in its knowledge, is not for us to explain. It is a mystery which we believe neither the writer nor the reader may comprehend. Still, it is a fact, beyond question, that of some things, Christ, when in the flesh, was absolutely ignorant. Of the time of his predicted advent he was, when he spoke the words, as ignorant as was man or angel. But was he always to remain in ignorance of that time? Can

he be ignorant of it as we write the sentence, or as the reader's eye may rest upon it? No one surely will affirm that now, as events are drawing to a crisis; now that the God-man is ordering his providences for the grand consummation, he knoweth not the time. "No man *knoweth.*" This was said eighteen hundred years since. This was then the state of knowledge on the subject. If the Son now knows the time, may not angels have learned it also? Has it not yet been revealed to those who are so intimately associated with that second coming? The Son of man is to come with "the holy angels." Are they yet to be apprised of this fact or of its nearness of approach, yea, of its definite period? While to these inquiries no absolutely positive answer may be given, it is, we affirm, a probability, approaching closely to a certainty, that it is a matter of absolute knowledge. And although "man" knew it not in the days of Christ's sojourn on earth, may he not learn it before the very time shall arrive, "lest that day come upon him unawares?" (Luke 21:34.) For an answer, we refer again to the command to Daniel to seal up the prophecy "even to the time of the end," and the subsequent assurance that the seals should be broken and "the wise should understand" (Dan. 12:4, 10); and to the testimony of Paul, who declares that "the children of light are not in darkness that the day should overtake them as a thief." (1 Thess. 5:4, 5.) The great reformer may not have been very presumptuous in his belief that "God would raise up some one who should be able to reckon up the times, and with certainty hit upon the very day."[1]

Is there, we ask, anything in the word of God to forbid our hope and expectation that the Lord will, if he has not already done it, imbue some diligent students with "wisdom," so that at this "time of the end" they may "understand" the import of these predictions?

Nor may we be at a loss to discover why it was that the definite time was not made known to the immediate disciples of Christ, and why it was withheld from many subsequent generations. The wisdom and the goodness of God are manifest in this divine arrangement. "I find in this concealment," remarks Dr. Seiss,[2] "the great unsearchable wisdom of the Author of salvation, in so arranging what he has said about the time as to secure the *same practical effects* for every age, without confining the promise to any." And Bickersteth[3] remarks, in answer to the question, "Why did he withhold the time?" "Look back. You stand on the eminence of eighteen centuries. See what these centuries have been. Generation after generation, apostles, martyrs, fathers, confessors, and reformers have lived and died. Mark all the conflicts through which the early Christians at-

[1] Luther; see Dr. Seiss' *Last Times*, p. 269.
[2] *The Ten Virgins*, p. 30.
[3] *Time to Favor Zion.*

UMI

response being a denial of his purpose to establish that kingdom which they expected would be here on earth, with him as their Prince, it is a virtual admission that *it would be so established.* The Savior would only remind them that it was not for *them* to know the *time* when it should be done. It is not for *you* to know—*you* of this generation, and it may have embraced many subsequent generations. It was in the *Father's power.* But if *they* were not to know the time, it does not follow that a knowledge of that time was always to be withheld from prayerful inquirers. It was in the Father's power not only to establish the kingdom, but to make known, if so he should be pleased to do, the time when it should be done; and especially as the period should arrive when, according to Daniel, "the wise would be made to understand" the contents of the sealed book; and when the "signs" of the times should clearly indicate the near approach of the great event. We see not that the response of the Savior is to bar or to discourage inquiry on the subject.

A second passage, which to some appears to be even more conclusive, as to the futility and impropriety of endeavoring to ascertain the time of the second advent, is the declaration of Jesus to his disciples as recorded, Mark 13:32: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Not designing to make a special point of the fact that reference is here made not to the *year*, but to the *day* and *hour* of his coming, it is yet worthy of some note, inasmuch as the specific day and hour are not embraced in the calculation of any. But even if they were, we see not that this utterance of the Savior forbids the hope of ascertaining them, much less does it prohibit positively or by implication an endeavor by the study of chronological prophecy to discover what may be the *year*, proximately at least. Jesus declares that neither man nor angel, nor the Son of man "*knoweth*" the day and hour. And the truthfulness of the declaration no one may question. But who is the Son of man, and what is the date, and what were the circumstances of the utterance? The Son is the same one precisely, of whom it is said, he "*increased* in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man." (Luke 2:52.) The same one who was, undoubtedly, in ignorance of some things, and it may be even of the time of his second coming, until the hour of his death. Christ was possessed of a two-fold nature. How the human nature of Christ, in intimate union and sympathy with the divine, thus closely associated with Omniscience itself, could be limited in its knowledge, is not for us to explain. It is a mystery which we believe neither the writer nor the reader may comprehend. Still, it is a fact, beyond question, that of some things, Christ, when in the flesh, was absolutely ignorant. Of the time of his predicted advent he was, when he spoke the words, as ignorant as was man or angel. But was he always to remain in ignorance of that time? Can

he be ignorant of it as we write the sentence, or as the reader's eye may rest upon it? No one surely will affirm that now, as events are drawing to a crisis; now that the God-man is ordering his providences for the grand consummation, he knoweth not the time. "No man *knoweth.*" This was said eighteen hundred years since. This was then the state of knowledge on the subject. If the Son now knows the time, may not angels have learned it also? Has it not yet been revealed to those who are so intimately associated with that second coming? The Son of man is to come with "the holy angels." Are they yet to be apprised of this fact or of its nearness of approach, yea, of its definite period? While to these inquiries no absolutely positive answer may be given, it is, we affirm, a probability, approaching closely to a certainty, that it is a matter of absolute knowledge. And although "man" knew it not in the days of Christ's sojourn on earth, may he not learn it before the very time shall arrive, "lest that day come upon him unawares?" (Luke 21:34.) For an answer, we refer again to the command to Daniel to seal up the prophecy "even to the time of the end," and the subsequent assurance that the seals should be broken and "the wise should understand" (Dan. 12:4, 10); and to the testimony of Paul, who declares that "the children of light are not in darkness that the day should overtake them as a thief." (1 Thess. 5:4, 5.) The great reformer may not have been very presumptuous in his belief that "God would raise up some one who should be able to reckon up the times, and with certainty hit upon the very day."[1]

Is there, we ask, anything in the word of God to forbid our hope and expectation that the Lord will, if he has not already done it, imbue some diligent students with "wisdom," so that at this "time of the end" they may "understand" the import of these predictions?

Nor may we be at a loss to discover why it was that the definite time was not made known to the immediate disciples of Christ, and why it was withheld from many subsequent generations. The wisdom and the goodness of God are manifest in this divine arrangement. "I find in this concealment," remarks Dr. Seiss,[2] "the great unsearchable wisdom of the Author of salvation, in so arranging what he has said about the time as to secure the *same practical effects* for every age, without confining the promise to any." And Bickersteth[3] remarks, in answer to the question, "Why did he withhold the time?" "Look back. You stand on the eminence of eighteen centuries. See what these centuries have been. Generation after generation, apostles, martyrs, fathers, confessors, and reformers have lived and died. Mark all the conflicts through which the early Christians at-

[1] Luther; see Dr. Seiss' *Last Times*, p. 269.
[2] *The Ten Virgins*, p. 30.
[3] *Time to Favor Zion.*

UMI

tained their triumphs, their labors, sufferings, persecutions, and martyrdoms. Go on to the rise of Popery and Mohammedanism; see the dark ages; mark the struggles of infant Protestantism, and its subsequent decay. Look at the present spread of infidelity among professedly Christian nations. Had the apostles been told all this must previously take place—all this corruption must spread over the world—what needless despondency and heart-sinkings must have overwhelmed them! Eighteen hundred years of deferred expectation—eighteen hundred years yet to remain of the Gentile monarchies—and eighteen hundred years of the treading under foot of Jerusalem! With that wisdom and love which marks all the Lord's providence to his Church, this dark scene was kept back." Thus we see the wisdom and goodness of the Savior's answer to the questioning disciples: "It is not for *you* to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." He would have his people in every age reap the spiritual benefit of a cherished expectation of his coming. The animating, purifying, and heavenly hope of that event he would have them ever enjoy. Hence, they were to watch for it; to anticipate it; to rejoice in it. There was to be a season of waiting. A knowlege of how long it was to be protracted he kindly withheld from them; that thus they might feel the power and influence of his oft-repeated injunction, "Watch; for ye know not when the Son of man cometh."

But it still may be asked, as it often has been: "Wherefore dwell on these unfulfilled predictions? What profit are we to derive from the study of them?" Much every way, is the unhesitating reply of those who wait for and love Christ's appearing, as did the aged Paul when he anticipated the crown of righteousness, which he was to receive at the coming of his Lord.

We may now consider briefly—

III. THE PRACTICAL MORAL BEARING AND INFLUENCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

If this doctrine of the personal coming of Christ before the Millenninm be true; if this advent is (as we believe the Scriptures declare) to be preceded by, attended with, and followed by most stupendous events; if the Son of man is to come to raise from their graves the bodies of his saints, constituting "the first resurrection," "the resurrection of the just;" and if living believers, who shall be waiting for his coming, at the time, are to be caught up to meet him in the air; if he is subsequently to appear in glory "with all his saints," visible to every eye, to take vengeance on his enemies, and to renovate this earth, purifying it by fire, and making it the fit abiding-place of his ransomed ones; if he will thus, at his coming, establish his kingdom in righteousness, and here personally reign with his risen saints; and if we are to watch for this advent as for that which may occur at any time; then, surely, all will admit that the doctrine *should* have a direct salutary moral influence upon our lives and our feelings. It *should* operate most decidedly to make us more holy in conversation and more heavenly-minded. It should stimulate to the cultivation of every Christian grace. If with any who profess to embrace the doctrine, it does not bring forth these fruits of godliness, the reason must be looked for in other causes than the tendency of the belief. It is the testimony of those who *fully, without wavering or doubt*, receive this as the revelation of our Lord, that in their own experience there are realized powerful incentives to holy living—that they may be ready, with lamps trimmed and burning, and with oil in their vessels, to enter into the marriage feast, when the Bridegroom, for whose coming they are looking and praying, shall make his appearance. "For myself," remarks Ryle, "I can only give my own individual testimony; but the little I know, experimentally, of the doctrine of Christ's second coming, makes me regard it as most practical and precious, and makes me long to see it more generally received. I find it a powerful spring and stimulus to holy living; a motive for patience, for moderation, for spiritual-mindedness; a test for the improvement of time, and a guage for all my actions."

This result is just what the whole tenor of the word of truth would lead us to expect. If attention has not been particularly drawn to the subject, it will, perhaps, be a matter of surprise to find that the prominent, we had almost said exclusive, motive to repentence, and to Christian diligence, and heavenly-mindedness and holiness of life, as urged in the Scriptures, is this very fact, the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. If other considerations are presented, this stands pre-eminent as the one incentive and stimulus to duty. DEATH is that to which attention, in our day, is mainly directed as a motive to prepare for future retribution. It is certainly well calculated to arouse the attention of those who have but a brief probation here to spend. Death is the sealing of the destiny of the soul, as there is no further opportunity for repentance; and yet it is a fact well deserving serious reflection, that very seldom is any allusion made to death by the Savior, in his discourses, or by the apostles in their letters. We cannot recall a solitary instance where the sinner is exhorted to repentance, or the believer to diligence and holiness, in view of this event, so certain to all, so uncertain as to the time of its occurrence, and so momentous in its immediate and in its ever-continuing consequences. It is not the motive urged home upon the conscience as a stimulus to effort. We do not mean to say that this may not be presented as a consideration well calculated of itself to make a deep impression. What we desire, particularly, to enforce is, that it is not *the* Scriptural motive—that which the Holy Spirit has presented as pre-eminently the most effective. In every epistle, except the brief

UMI

tained their triumphs, their labors, sufferings, persecutions, and martyrdoms. Go on to the rise of Popery and Mohammedanism; see the dark ages; mark the struggles of infant Protestantism, and its subsequent decay. Look at the present spread of infidelity among professedly Christian nations. Had the apostles been told all this must previously take place—all this corruption must spread over the world—what needless despondency and heart-sinkings must have overwhelmed them! Eighteen hundred years of deferred expectation—eighteen hundred years yet to remain of the Gentile monarchies—and eighteen hundred years of the treading under foot of Jerusalem! With that wisdom and love which marks all the Lord's providence to his Church, this dark scene was kept back." Thus we see the wisdom and goodness of the Savior's answer to the questioning disciples: "It is not for *you* to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." He would have his people in every age reap the spiritual benefit of a cherished expectation of his coming. The animating, purifying, and heavenly hope of that event he would have them ever enjoy. Hence, they were to watch for it; to anticipate it; to rejoice in it. There was to be a season of waiting. A knowlege of how long it was to be protracted he kindly withheld from them; that thus they might feel the power and influence of his oft-repeated injunction, "Watch; for ye know not when the Son of man cometh."

But it still may be asked, as it often has been: "Wherefore dwell on these unfulfilled predictions? What profit are we to derive from the study of them?" Much every way, is the unhesitating reply of those who wait for and love Christ's appearing, as did the aged Paul when he anticipated the crown of righteousness, which he was to receive at the coming of his Lord.

We may now consider briefly—

III. THE PRACTICAL MORAL BEARING AND INFLUENCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

If this doctrine of the personal coming of Christ before the Millenninm be true; if this advent is (as we believe the Scriptures declare) to be preceded by, attended with, and followed by most stupendous events; if the Son of man is to come to raise from their graves the bodies of his saints, constituting "the first resurrection," "the resurrection of the just;" and if living believers, who shall be waiting for his coming, at the time, are to be caught up to meet him in the air; if he is subsequently to appear in glory "with all his saints," visible to every eye, to take vengeance on his enemies, and to renovate this earth, purifying it by fire, and making it the fit abiding-place of his ransomed ones; if he will thus, at his coming, establish his kingdom in righteousness, and here personally reign with his risen saints; and if we are to watch for this advent as for that which may occur at any time; then, surely, all will admit that the doctrine *should* have a direct salutary moral influence upon our lives and our feelings. It *should* operate most decidedly to make us more holy in conversation and more heavenly-minded. It should stimulate to the cultivation of every Christian grace. If with any who profess to embrace the doctrine, it does not bring forth these fruits of godliness, the reason must be looked for in other causes than the tendency of the belief. It is the testimony of those who *fully, without wavering or doubt*, receive this as the revelation of our Lord, that in their own experience there are realized powerful incentives to holy living—that they may be ready, with lamps trimmed and burning, and with oil in their vessels, to enter into the marriage feast, when the Bridegroom, for whose coming they are looking and praying, shall make his appearance. "For myself," remarks Ryle, "I can only give my own individual testimony; but the little I know, experimentally, of the doctrine of Christ's second coming, makes me regard it as most practical and precious, and makes me long to see it more generally received. I find it a powerful spring and stimulus to holy living; a motive for patience, for moderation, for spiritual-mindedness; a test for the improvement of time, and a guage for all my actions."

This result is just what the whole tenor of the word of truth would lead us to expect. If attention has not been particularly drawn to the subject, it will, perhaps, be a matter of surprise to find that the prominent, we had almost said exclusive, motive to repentence, and to Christian diligence, and heavenly-mindedness and holiness of life, as urged in the Scriptures, is this very fact, the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. If other considerations are presented, this stands pre-eminent as the one incentive and stimulus to duty. DEATH is that to which attention, in our day, is mainly directed as a motive to prepare for future retribution. It is certainly well calculated to arouse the attention of those who have but a brief probation here to spend. Death is the sealing of the destiny of the soul, as there is no further opportunity for repentance; and yet it is a fact well deserving serious reflection, that very seldom is any allusion made to death by the Savior, in his discourses, or by the apostles in their letters. We cannot recall a solitary instance where the sinner is exhorted to repentance, or the believer to diligence and holiness, in view of this event, so certain to all, so uncertain as to the time of its occurrence, and so momentous in its immediate and in its ever-continuing consequences. It is not the motive urged home upon the conscience as a stimulus to effort. We do not mean to say that this may not be presented as a consideration well calculated of itself to make a deep impression. What we desire, particularly, to enforce is, that it is not *the* Scriptural motive—that which the Holy Spirit has presented as pre-eminently the most effective. In every epistle, except the brief

UMI

ones, the second and third of John, and that to Philemon, there are allusions—and in several, very many allusions—to the second coming of Christ, as a motive to a holy life; whereas, not one solitary reference, it is believed, is to be found to death as an incentive to the impenitent, or a stimulus to the believer. And, furthermore, it is worthy of note that the uniform testimony of the ministers of Christ is that there is scarcely a subject, if there be one, which is urged upon the attention of their hearers with so little *permanent* benefit as death. For upwards of thirty years has the writer preached the Gospel, and has sought for motives to urge the sinner to forsake his sins, and the Christian to increased devotedness; and many have been his appeals, at funerals and upon other occasions, based on the certainty of death, its solemnities and results, and he is constrained to declare that, so far as memory serves him, in but two solitary cases, and these doubtful ones, has he had evidence of any lasting benefit as the result of these appeals. Now, why is it so? Death, wherever it occurs, makes a present solemn impression, awakens serious thought, and sometimes urges to resolutions of amendment. But where are to be found the *permanent* good results? They are confessedly but few. Do not men cooly discuss their plans of business and of pleasure even as they follow the corpse to the tomb? yea, often indulge in levity of feeling, and in the most trifling conversation? Why is it that these solemn admonitions, on the doings of death and in the very presence of the destroyer, so very generally fail to secure any abiding impressions for good? Why are our exhortations, and our warnings, in view of the opened grave, so barren of results? Can we find an all-sufficient, satisfactory answer in the thought, that the frequency of the occurrence so familiarizes the mind to the scene that susceptibility to salutary impressions is entirely or almost wholly lost? We think not. This may have, and undoubtedly has, its effect; but a solution of the question we must find in the fact that, agreeably to the Divine arrangement, as made known in the Scripture, death is not the subject of appeal. Everywhere it is the second coming of our Lord.

But it may be inquired, as it has often been, is not death to him who experiences it, to all intents and purposes, the same as the advent of Christ? And may we not understand by the expression, "The coming of the Son of man," where it is presented as a motive for watchfulness, this very providence? To both inquiries we are constrained to give an emphatic negative. Death and the coming of Christ are, in the Scriptures, widely contrasted. Death is the coming of the "king of terrors." It is a positive evil in itself, the result of Adam's apostasy. True, to the believer, it is, by the mercy of God, shorn of its terrors, and made a "gain;" only so, however, because of what sin hath brought upon our blighted earth. A "gain" only because we live in a world laboring under the curse; where life is a probation, a

discipline; and where no direct communion with him who is the believer's hope, and joy, and blessedness is had, except by faith. Death is, of itself, a positive evil; whereas, the coming of the Son of man is represented as a glorious event. Nowhere is death presented as the object of watchfulness, and by no legitimate reasoning can we substitute the "coming of the Son of man" for it. The exhortation to "watch for the coming of the Son of man" embraces much more than to watch for the approach of death. The mind is to be fixed on the stupendous, startling scenes which are connected with the second advent; and which are so intimately related, not only to the interests of individuals, but to those of the whole Church, and to the destinies of all nations. Read the comforting assurance of the Savior to his sorrowing disciples: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you"—what then? Is it "I will come to you at death that you may enjoy it?" Ah, no! "I will *come again* and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also;" referring them to his predicted second advent, as the time when this blessedness would be fully realized.

Nothing is more obvious than the marked prominence given in the New Testament to the practical moral bearing of the doctrine of the second advent.

Professor Hackett, of the Newton Theological Seminary (who is not a Millennarian), a candid and distinguished commentator on the Acts of the Apostles, bears this testimony (p. 80):

> "The final coming of Christ was the great consummation on which the strongest desires of the souls of the first believers were fixed, and to which their thoughts and hopes were habitually turned. They lived with reference to this event. They labored to be prepared for it. They were constantly, in the expressive language of Peter, looking for and (in their impatience, as it were) hastening the arrival of the day of God. . . . . The apostles, as well as the first Christians in general, comprehended the grandeur of that occasion. It filled their circle of view; stood forth, to their contemplation, as the point of culminating interest in their own and the world's history; threw into comparative insignificance the present time, death, all intermediate events, and made them feel that the manifestation of Christ with its consequences of indescribable moment to all true believers, was the grand object which they were to keep in view as the end of their toils, the commencement and perfection of their glorious immortality. In such a state of intimate sympathy with an event, so familiar to their thoughts, they derived, and must have derived, their chief incentives to action from the prospect of that future glory. As we should expect, they hold it up to the people of God to encourage them in affliction, to awaken them to fidelity, zeal, and perseverance; and on the other hand, appeal to it to *warn the wicked and impress upon them the necessity of preparation for the revelations of that day*. If modern Christians," he continues to say, "sympathized more fully with the the sacred writers on this subject, it would bring both their conduct and their style of religious instruction into nearer correspondence with the lives and teaching of the primitive examples of our faith."

This emphatic statement is fully confirmed by a reference to

ones, the second and third of John, and that to Philemon, there are allusions—and in several, very many allusions—to the second coming of Christ, as a motive to a holy life; whereas, not one solitary reference, it is believed, is to be found to death as an incentive to the impenitent, or a stimulus to the believer. And, furthermore, it is worthy of note that the uniform testimony of the ministers of Christ is that there is scarcely a subject, if there be one, which is urged upon the attention of their hearers with so little *permanent* benefit as death. For upwards of thirty years has the writer preached the Gospel, and has sought for motives to urge the sinner to forsake his sins, and the Christian to increased devotedness; and many have been his appeals, at funerals and upon other occasions, based on the certainty of death, its solemnities and results, and he is constrained to declare that, so far as memory serves him, in but two solitary cases, and these doubtful ones, has he had evidence of any lasting benefit as the result of these appeals. Now, why is it so? Death, wherever it occurs, makes a present solemn impression, awakens serious thought, and sometimes urges to resolutions of amendment. But where are to be found the *permanent* good results? They are confessedly but few. Do not men cooly discuss their plans of business and of pleasure even as they follow the corpse to the tomb? yea, often indulge in levity of feeling, and in the most trifling conversation? Why is it that these solemn admonitions, on the doings of death and in the very presence of the destroyer, so very generally fail to secure any abiding impressions for good? Why are our exhortations, and our warnings, in view of the opened grave, so barren of results? Can we find an all-sufficient, satisfactory answer in the thought, that the frequency of the occurrence so familiarizes the mind to the scene that susceptibility to salutary impressions is entirely or almost wholly lost? We think not. This may have, and undoubtedly has, its effect; but a solution of the question we must find in the fact that, agreeably to the Divine arrangement, as made known in the Scripture, death is not the subject of appeal. Everywhere it is the second coming of our Lord.

But it may be inquired, as it has often been, is not death to him who experiences it, to all intents and purposes, the same as the advent of Christ? And may we not understand by the expression, "The coming of the Son of man," where it is presented as a motive for watchfulness, this very providence? To both inquiries we are constrained to give an emphatic negative. Death and the coming of Christ are, in the Scriptures, widely contrasted. Death is the coming of the "king of terrors." It is a positive evil in itself, the result of Adam's apostasy. True, to the believer, it is, by the mercy of God, shorn of its terrors, and made a "gain;" only so, however, because of what sin hath brought upon our blighted earth. A "gain" only because we live in a world laboring under the curse; where life is a probation, a

discipline; and where no direct communion with him who is the believer's hope, and joy, and blessedness is had, except by faith. Death is, of itself, a positive evil; whereas, the coming of the Son of man is represented as a glorious event. Nowhere is death presented as the object of watchfulness, and by no legitimate reasoning can we substitute the "coming of the Son of man" for it. The exhortation to "watch for the coming of the Son of man" embraces much more than to watch for the approach of death. The mind is to be fixed on the stupendous, startling scenes which are connected with the second advent; and which are so intimately related, not only to the interests of individuals, but to those of the whole Church, and to the destinies of all nations. Read the comforting assurance of the Savior to his sorrowing disciples: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you"—what then? Is it "I will come to you at death that you may enjoy it?" Ah, no! "I will *come again* and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also;" referring them to his predicted second advent, as the time when this blessedness would be fully realized.

Nothing is more obvious than the marked prominence given in the New Testament to the practical moral bearing of the doctrine of the second advent.

Professor Hackett, of the Newton Theological Seminary (who is not a Millennarian), a candid and distinguished commentator on the Acts of the Apostles, bears this testimony (p. 80):

> "The final coming of Christ was the great consummation on which the strongest desires of the souls of the first believers were fixed, and to which their thoughts and hopes were habitually turned. They lived with reference to this event. They labored to be prepared for it. They were constantly, in the expressive language of Peter, looking for and (in their impatience, as it were) hastening the arrival of the day of God. . . . . The apostles, as well as the first Christians in general, comprehended the grandeur of that occasion. It filled their circle of view; stood forth, to their contemplation, as the point of culminating interest in their own and the world's history; threw into comparative insignificance the present time, death, all intermediate events, and made them feel that the manifestation of Christ with its consequences of indescribable moment to all true believers, was the grand object which they were to keep in view as the end of their toils, the commencement and perfection of their glorious immortality. In such a state of intimate sympathy with an event, so familiar to their thoughts, they derived, and must have derived, their chief incentives to action from the prospect of that future glory. As we should expect, they hold it up to the people of God to encourage them in affliction, to awaken them to fidelity, zeal, and perseverance; and on the other hand, appeal to it to *warn the wicked and impress upon them the necessity of preparation for the revelations of that day*. If modern Christians," he continues to say, "sympathized more fully with the the sacred writers on this subject, it would bring both their conduct and their style of religious instruction into nearer correspondence with the lives and teaching of the primitive examples of our faith."

This emphatic statement is fully confirmed by a reference to

the Scriptures themselves. A few passages in illustration may be presented.

As an appeal to ministerial fidelity and diligence, hear Paul to Timothy:

"I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, *at his appearing and his kingdom*, preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." (2 Tim. 4:1, 2.)

So Peter:

"The elders which are among you I exhort, ... feed the flock of God, ... and when *the Chief Shepherd shall appear* ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." (1 Pet. 5:2, 4.)

Are careless sinners to be aroused?

"What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul; or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." (Matt. 16:26, 27.)

"Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his glory." (Luke 9:26.)

Are men called to repentance?

"Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ . . . . whom the heavens must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things." (Acts 3:19, 21.)

Are saints exhorted to holiness of life and spirituality of mind?

"When Christ who is our life *shall appear*, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. Mortify, *therefore*, your members which are upon the earth. (Col. 3:4, 5.)

"Denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ. (Tit. 2:12, 18.)

"And now, little children, abide in him: that *when he shall appear*, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him *at his coming*." (1 John 2:28.)

Are patience, forbearance, and long-suffering under persecutions and trials enjoined?

"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, ... when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." (2 Thess. 1:6, 10.)

"Be patient, therefore, unto the coming of the Lord . . . . Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (Jas. 5:7, 8.)

Is the advanced pilgrim to be cheered with the prospect before him?

"I am now ready to be offered and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me *at that day*; and not to me only but unto all them also that *love* his appearing." (2 Tim. 4:6, 8.)

Such are specimens of the many instances where the practical efficiency of this doctrine is presented. It stands forth in the word of God, unequalled in its power to arouse the careless, to comfort the mourner, to incite to holiness of life, and to exalt the Savior and his cross.—*Selected.*

EDITORIAL.

WE are happy to announce that THE QUARTERLY has already received a list of subscribers sufficiently large to insure its permanent publication; though we do not yet feel justified in making the proposed enlargement of twenty pages. We are grateful for the hearty welcome it has received from every quarter; for we have received words of encouragement to the Editor, accompanied with flattering enconiums of the writers in the first Number, from the shores of the Pacific, from the Southern, Western, and Eastern States, and, also, from England.

Our enterprize was announced upon the faith of a few, who believed such a magazine would be sustained because *it was needed*. The result has justified their expectation. We present our second Number with the hope it may fully meet the expectations formed by its predecessor.

HAVING had the privilege of reading the manuscript of a new work entitled *The Doctrine of Immortality*, by Eld. James H. Whitmore, we have no hesitation in pronouncing it the finest thing ever written upon that subject. It is a carefully matured and finished work. Not so learned as Prof. Hudson's books, but quite as convincing, if not more so. It is, in short, a lucid, perspicuous, and complete view of the so-called life and death question. The work will be issued by the Western Association. The table of contents (we quote the heads of the chapters) is as follows: "Heathen Belief;" "Jewish Belief;" "Early Christian and Mediæval Doctrine;" "The Argument from Reason;" "The Argument from Scripture;" "The Lesson of Creation;" "The Adamic Penalty;" "Traduction *vs.* Creationism;" "General Testimony of Scripture;" "Life and Death;" "The Intermediate State;" "The Christian Redemption."

We assure our readers of a rich feast in this work. It will do much toward convicting our opponents who will read; and confirming in the faith the many who are still oppressed with doubts.

the Scriptures themselves. A few passages in illustration may be presented.

As an appeal to ministerial fidelity and diligence, hear Paul to Timothy:

"I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, *at his appearing and his kingdom*, preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." (2 Tim. 4:1, 2.)

So Peter:

"The elders which are among you I exhort, ... feed the flock of God, ... and when *the Chief Shepherd shall appear* ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." (1 Pet. 5:2, 4.)

Are careless sinners to be aroused?

"What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul; or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." (Matt. 16:26, 27.)

"Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his glory." (Luke 9:26.)

Are men called to repentance?

"Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ . . . . whom the heavens must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things." (Acts 3:19, 21.)

Are saints exhorted to holiness of life and spirituality of mind?

"When Christ who is our life *shall appear*, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. Mortify, *therefore*, your members which are upon the earth. (Col. 3:4, 5.)

"Denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ. (Tit. 2:12, 18.)

"And now, little children, abide in him: that *when he shall appear*, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him *at his coming*." (1 John 2:28.)

Are patience, forbearance, and long-suffering under persecutions and trials enjoined?

"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, ... when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." (2 Thess. 1:6, 10.)

"Be patient, therefore, unto the coming of the Lord . . . . Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (Jas. 5:7, 8.)

Is the advanced pilgrim to be cheered with the prospect before him?

"I am now ready to be offered and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me *at that day*; and not to me only but unto all them also that *love* his appearing." (2 Tim. 4:6, 8.)

Such are specimens of the many instances where the practical efficiency of this doctrine is presented. It stands forth in the word of God, unequalled in its power to arouse the careless, to comfort the mourner, to incite to holiness of life, and to exalt the Savior and his cross.—*Selected.*

EDITORIAL.

WE are happy to announce that THE QUARTERLY has already received a list of subscribers sufficiently large to insure its permanent publication; though we do not yet feel justified in making the proposed enlargement of twenty pages. We are grateful for the hearty welcome it has received from every quarter; for we have received words of encouragement to the Editor, accompanied with flattering enconiums of the writers in the first Number, from the shores of the Pacific, from the Southern, Western, and Eastern States, and, also, from England.

Our enterprize was announced upon the faith of a few, who believed such a magazine would be sustained because *it was needed*. The result has justified their expectation. We present our second Number with the hope it may fully meet the expectations formed by its predecessor.

HAVING had the privilege of reading the manuscript of a new work entitled *The Doctrine of Immortality*, by Eld. James H. Whitmore, we have no hesitation in pronouncing it the finest thing ever written upon that subject. It is a carefully matured and finished work. Not so learned as Prof. Hudson's books, but quite as convincing, if not more so. It is, in short, a lucid, perspicuous, and complete view of the so-called life and death question. The work will be issued by the Western Association. The table of contents (we quote the heads of the chapters) is as follows: "Heathen Belief;" "Jewish Belief;" "Early Christian and Mediæval Doctrine;" "The Argument from Reason;" "The Argument from Scripture;" "The Lesson of Creation;" "The Adamic Penalty;" "Traduction *vs.* Creationism;" "General Testimony of Scripture;" "Life and Death;" "The Intermediate State;" "The Christian Redemption."

We assure our readers of a rich feast in this work. It will do much toward convicting our opponents who will read; and confirming in the faith the many who are still oppressed with doubts.

By way of experiment, we sent our initial number to several secular and orthodox journals, to see what notice it would elicit from them. One simply gave the list of contents; several added a few contemptuous words concerning *the ability* manifested in its pages; the rest took no notice of it. However, we succeeded in pleasing the class for whom The Quarterly was designed; hence, we do not feel at all hurt by the coolness of its reception among those whose best wish for it would naturally be that it might speedily expire.

In the New Testament, the second advent of our Savior is like a central sun, holding all other truths in their proper orbit. It is presented as the world's crisis; as the pivot on which time swings into eternity. Here faith ends in sight; hope is lost in realization; all the appliances of the strictly temporal are forever laid aside, and only the things which cannot be shaken continue on. Even inanimate creation, as realizing the glorious results of the changes then to be wrought in our world, is presented as groaning and travailing in pain while waiting in earnest expectation for the full revelation of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The New Testament Church seems fallen in love with a *personal* Savior, and never tires of reiterating in varied form his parting promise to *come again*. It is not only to them a blessed hope, but it is their only hope. If they indulged any other (save hopes distinctly stated to be subsidiary to this), they failed to record it.

What a different relation this hope of the return of a personal Savior occupies in most of the modern systems of theology claiming the New Testament as their basis! Instead of a central sun, it is mere nebula, often quite invisible, even to the telescope of faith, and without any obvious relations in their systems. Its time, objects, and manner are so indefinite and uncertain as to subject one who is disposed to thoroughly investigate them to the suspicion of being a meddler in the secret things declared to belong to the Almighty.

The facts against immaterialism are seldom more tersely stated than in the following paragraph, setting forth the position of that world-renowned writer, the Duke of Argyll:

"Nor in the intangible phenomena of mind is the chain of cause and effect broken. If the blood ceases to circulate, or the chest to heave, in an instant all our thoughts perish. Prolonged intellectual exercise produces bodily exhaustion, showing that mind and body are inseparably connected. To go more into detail, from the reptile to man an ascending scale of mental capacity is coincident with an ascending degree of cerebral organization; and many of the peculiarities of intelligence and disposition may be read in the features and shape of the head. Moreover, every physician knows that from a change in the substance and structure of the brain, the pure may become impure; the loving, malignant; the thoughtful imbecile; or the whole man may live for years without consciousness and without emotion. No series of facts can be more complete or more conclusive than that which tends to establish the truth that the brain—a compound of water, fat, albumen, and phosphates—generates thought."

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—JANUARY, 1870.—NO. III.

THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO ABRAHAM.

"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." (Gal. 3: 8.)

The epistle of Paul to the Galatians, which contains the subject of this article, was called forth by the introduction among them of a revived Judaism,[1] which resulted in a perverted gospel.[2] We do not use the term Judaism in an offensive, but in its expressive sense. Says Paul, "I profited [in time past] in the *Jews' religion*." That is, he was governed in his religious views by the principles, customs, and traditions of the Jewish church.[3] The gospel which he had now espoused was a different religion, with different objects, and inspiring new hopes and aims. And any attempt to mingle the obsolete principles or customs of "the Jews' religion"[4] with the faith of the gospel was Judaizing. We use the term Judaism, then, as expressive of the principles held by the Jews in their religion; and not as a term of reproach; except in so far as any term which describes error must necessarily be a reproach, be it never so highly esteemed; even as any name indicative of truth and right principles is in reality honorable, be it never so much despised by the masses.

The fundamental error of all Judaism is that it confounds type with antitype; the carnal with the spiritual; the law with

[1] 2: 11-21. [2] 1: 7. [3] vv. 13, 14.
[4] Evidently, by the expression "the Jews' religion" Paul refers not to the *true* religion of the Old Testament Scriptures, but to his experience, as he says, while "after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." (Acts 26: 5.) Pharisaic doctrine was frequently condemned by Christ as corrupting leaven.

UMI

By way of experiment, we sent our initial number to several secular and orthodox journals, to see what notice it would elicit from them. One simply gave the list of contents; several added a few contemptuous words concerning *the ability* manifested in its pages; the rest took no notice of it. However, we succeeded in pleasing the class for whom The Quarterly was designed; hence, we do not feel at all hurt by the coolness of its reception among those whose best wish for it would naturally be that it might speedily expire.

In the New Testament, the second advent of our Savior is like a central sun, holding all other truths in their proper orbit. It is presented as the world's crisis; as the pivot on which time swings into eternity. Here faith ends in sight; hope is lost in realization; all the appliances of the strictly temporal are forever laid aside, and only the things which cannot be shaken continue on. Even inanimate creation, as realizing the glorious results of the changes then to be wrought in our world, is presented as groaning and travailing in pain while waiting in earnest expectation for the full revelation of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The New Testament Church seems fallen in love with a *personal* Savior, and never tires of reiterating in varied form his parting promise to *come again*. It is not only to them a blessed hope, but it is their only hope. If they indulged any other (save hopes distinctly stated to be subsidiary to this), they failed to record it.

What a different relation this hope of the return of a personal Savior occupies in most of the modern systems of theology claiming the New Testament as their basis! Instead of a central sun, it is mere nebula, often quite invisible, even to the telescope of faith, and without any obvious relations in their systems. Its time, objects, and manner are so indefinite and uncertain as to subject one who is disposed to thoroughly investigate them to the suspicion of being a meddler in the secret things declared to belong to the Almighty.

The facts against immaterialism are seldom more tersely stated than in the following paragraph, setting forth the position of that world-renowned writer, the Duke of Argyll:

"Nor in the intangible phenomena of mind is the chain of cause and effect broken. If the blood ceases to circulate, or the chest to heave, in an instant all our thoughts perish. Prolonged intellectual exercise produces bodily exhaustion, showing that mind and body are inseparably connected. To go more into detail, from the reptile to man an ascending scale of mental capacity is coincident with an ascending degree of cerebral organization; and many of the peculiarities of intelligence and disposition may be read in the features and shape of the head. Moreover, every physician knows that from a change in the substance and structure of the brain, the pure may become impure; the loving, malignant; the thoughtful imbecile; or the whole man may live for years without consciousness and without emotion. No series of facts can be more complete or more conclusive than that which tends to establish the truth that the brain—a compound of water, fat, albumen, and phosphates—generates thought."

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—JANUARY, 1870.—NO. III.

THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO ABRAHAM.

"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." (Gal. 3: 8.)

The epistle of Paul to the Galatians, which contains the subject of this article, was called forth by the introduction among them of a revived Judaism,[1] which resulted in a perverted gospel.[2] We do not use the term Judaism in an offensive, but in its expressive sense. Says Paul, "I profited [in time past] in the *Jews' religion*." That is, he was governed in his religious views by the principles, customs, and traditions of the Jewish church.[3] The gospel which he had now espoused was a different religion, with different objects, and inspiring new hopes and aims. And any attempt to mingle the obsolete principles or customs of "the Jews' religion"[4] with the faith of the gospel was Judaizing. We use the term Judaism, then, as expressive of the principles held by the Jews in their religion; and not as a term of reproach; except in so far as any term which describes error must necessarily be a reproach, be it never so highly esteemed; even as any name indicative of truth and right principles is in reality honorable, be it never so much despised by the masses.

The fundamental error of all Judaism is that it confounds type with antitype; the carnal with the spiritual; the law with

[1] 2: 11-21. [2] 1: 7. [3] vv. 13, 14.
[4] Evidently, by the expression "the Jews' religion" Paul refers not to the *true* religion of the Old Testament Scriptures, but to his experience, as he says, while "after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." (Acts 26: 5.) Pharisaic doctrine was frequently condemned by Christ as corrupting leaven.

UMI

the gospel; the corruptible with the incorruptible; the things which pertain to flesh and blood with those pertaining to the incorruptible state; in short, the temporal with the eternal. This appears in the Galatian heresy. Circumcision was typical; was a sign, or seal, of faith in the seed promised to Abraham.[1] When Christ, the true seed, came, the rite expired by limitation. The promise it looked to was fulfilled; and from thenceforth, in the economy of salvation, "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." All the rites and ceremonies of the Jews' religion were made useless by the death and resurrection of Christ; because they had no merit, except as symbols of faith that God would verify his promises concerning a Redeemer and redemption for the world. Therefore it was foolishness to sacrifice sheep and bullocks for sin in symbol of an expected divine offering for sins, after Jesus had "offered one sacrifice for sins forever, and sat down at the right hand of God" as kingly mediator for all who would come to the Father through him.[2] So, too, it was folly to practice any other of the Jewish ordinances. They had died a natural death;[3] and to practice them was to seek righteousness in the deeds of the law rather than from the great fountain of righteousness, Abraham's promised Seed, and thus fall from grace.[4]

The Judaizing teachers at Galatia sought to impose circumcision upon the church as a means of justification and righteousness. Paul does not direct any special argument against this rite, but lays the ax at the root of the tree, and shows that the whole Mosaic system, with its rites, ceremonies, and temporal promises, was a thing of the past. We, Jews and Gentiles, are no longer under it, or bound by it. We are not under law, but under grace. The reign of the schoolmaster is ended. So he sweeps the Galatian heresy away by showing that not circumcision only, but *all* the typical promises, rites, and ceremonies of the law had ceased to have any obligation; for now "neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; *but a new creature.*"

And the language the apostle employs in overthrowing this

[1] Gen. 15: 4-6; Rom. 4: 9-11. [2] Heb. 10: 12. [3] Rom. 6: 6; 6: 15; Gal. 2: 25. [4] Gal. 5: 1-6; 2: 15, 16.

exhibition of Judaism is the fervid utterance of one who realizes that he is opposing a fatal error. What must have been the intensity of that conviction which could call from Paul's pen the repeated anathema—"If any preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed!"[1] or the declaration—"I would they were even cut off, which trouble you."[2] Well may every professed teacher of the gospel carefully inquire whether they preach or pervert that gospel which Paul ministered.

The word gospel means simply a good or joyful message. It is good news or glad tidings. The gospel of the kingdom,[3] the gospel of Jesus Christ,[4] the gospel of God,[5] my [Paul's] gospel,[6] the everlasting gospel,[7] and the gospel preached to Abraham,[8] are a unit. They are the same good news of salvation from the fall, by pardon of sin and the obtaining of eternal life through Jesus Christ, together with the final restitution of *all things promised* in him. Whatever other appellations it may receive, it is never called *a* gospel, as though it might be one among many; but it is everywhere and always *the* gospel; as if there were no other, as indeed there is not. True, Paul speaks once of "another gospel;"[9] but he immediately explains that it is not really "another," but is only a seeming, a counterfeit, or perverted gospel.

The Gospel includes all that is revealed pertaining to the salvation which is in or through Jesus Christ, whether it relates to this world, or that which is to come. A perfect understanding of all its parts is not necessary to insure the salvation it brings; though we may safely say that willful ignorance of any portion of it will, if persisted in, fatally jeopardize any soul's prospect for eternal life. Though it is not the object of this article to discuss the amount of knowledge necessary in order to salvation, we may remark the words of Jesus, "He that cometh to me will I in no wise cast out." The chief requirements seem to be a sensibility of a lost condition, and faith in Christ as a savior. If we have faith, and believe that God is, and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek unto him, we may come to him, even if we do not understand the nature of the reward promised, or when and where it is to be given. But after we

[1] Gal. 1: 8, 9. [2] Gal. 5: 12. [3] Matt. 24: 14. [4] Mark 1: 1. [5] 1 Tim. 1: 11. [6] 2 Tim. 2: 8. [7] Rev. 14: 6. [8] Gal. 3: 8. [9] Gal. 1: 6.

the gospel; the corruptible with the incorruptible; the things which pertain to flesh and blood with those pertaining to the incorruptible state; in short, the temporal with the eternal. This appears in the Galatian heresy. Circumcision was typical; was a sign, or seal, of faith in the seed promised to Abraham.[1] When Christ, the true seed, came, the rite expired by limitation. The promise it looked to was fulfilled; and from thenceforth, in the economy of salvation, "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." All the rites and ceremonies of the Jews' religion were made useless by the death and resurrection of Christ; because they had no merit, except as symbols of faith that God would verify his promises concerning a Redeemer and redemption for the world. Therefore it was foolishness to sacrifice sheep and bullocks for sin in symbol of an expected divine offering for sins, after Jesus had "offered one sacrifice for sins forever, and sat down at the right hand of God" as kingly mediator for all who would come to the Father through him.[2] So, too, it was folly to practice any other of the Jewish ordinances. They had died a natural death;[3] and to practice them was to seek righteousness in the deeds of the law rather than from the great fountain of righteousness, Abraham's promised Seed, and thus fall from grace.[4]

The Judaizing teachers at Galatia sought to impose circumcision upon the church as a means of justification and righteousness. Paul does not direct any special argument against this rite, but lays the ax at the root of the tree, and shows that the whole Mosaic system, with its rites, ceremonies, and temporal promises, was a thing of the past. We, Jews and Gentiles, are no longer under it, or bound by it. We are not under law, but under grace. The reign of the schoolmaster is ended. So he sweeps the Galatian heresy away by showing that not circumcision only, but *all* the typical promises, rites, and ceremonies of the law had ceased to have any obligation; for now "neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; *but a new creature.*"

And the language the apostle employs in overthrowing this

[1] Gen. 15: 4-6; Rom. 4: 9-11. [2] Heb. 10: 12. [3] Rom. 6: 6; 6: 15; Gal. 2: 25. [4] Gal. 5: 1-6; 2: 15, 16.

exhibition of Judaism is the fervid utterance of one who realizes that he is opposing a fatal error. What must have been the intensity of that conviction which could call from Paul's pen the repeated anathema—"If any preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed!"[1] or the declaration—"I would they were even cut off, which trouble you."[2] Well may every professed teacher of the gospel carefully inquire whether they preach or pervert that gospel which Paul ministered.

The word gospel means simply a good or joyful message. It is good news or glad tidings. The gospel of the kingdom,[3] the gospel of Jesus Christ,[4] the gospel of God,[5] my [Paul's] gospel,[6] the everlasting gospel,[7] and the gospel preached to Abraham,[8] are a unit. They are the same good news of salvation from the fall, by pardon of sin and the obtaining of eternal life through Jesus Christ, together with the final restitution of *all things promised* in him. Whatever other appellations it may receive, it is never called *a* gospel, as though it might be one among many; but it is everywhere and always *the* gospel; as if there were no other, as indeed there is not. True, Paul speaks once of "another gospel;"[9] but he immediately explains that it is not really "another," but is only a seeming, a counterfeit, or perverted gospel.

The Gospel includes all that is revealed pertaining to the salvation which is in or through Jesus Christ, whether it relates to this world, or that which is to come. A perfect understanding of all its parts is not necessary to insure the salvation it brings; though we may safely say that willful ignorance of any portion of it will, if persisted in, fatally jeopardize any soul's prospect for eternal life. Though it is not the object of this article to discuss the amount of knowledge necessary in order to salvation, we may remark the words of Jesus, "He that cometh to me will I in no wise cast out." The chief requirements seem to be a sensibility of a lost condition, and faith in Christ as a savior. If we have faith, and believe that God is, and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek unto him, we may come to him, even if we do not understand the nature of the reward promised, or when and where it is to be given. But after we

[1] Gal. 1: 8, 9. [2] Gal. 5: 12. [3] Matt. 24: 14. [4] Mark 1: 1. [5] 1 Tim. 1: 11. [6] 2 Tim. 2: 8. [7] Rev. 14: 6. [8] Gal. 3: 8. [9] Gal. 1: 6.

are received we must grow in both grace and knowledge of the truth.

Leaving, then, the question of the amount of knowledge essential to salvation, let us inquire when and where the gospel was preached to Abraham, and in what it consisted. And that we may be clearly understood, we remark, that Abraham received two great promises, the one relating to temporal, the other to eternal things; the one to be fulfilled in time, the other in eternity; the former the pledge, or the assurance of the latter. These promises stand related to each other as shadow and substance, as type and antitype. The first and lesser promise was given that we who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel might find strong consolation in the record of God's dealings in the past, because of the assurance it gives of the faithfulness of him who has promised. Finding all that relates to the temporal fulfilled not only to the letter, but in jot and tittle, faith has a sure foundation for confidence, and while we hope for the eternal things which as yet we see not, still do we with patience wait for them.

The first mention we find of Abraham, beyond the bare record of his existence and genealogy, is in the following language:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee; and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families [peoples or nations] of the earth be blessed."[1]

In obedience to this divine call, Abram (for his name had not yet received the significant change) went forth, not knowing whither he went, but intent upon obeying the Lord. And truly no higher motive for obedience could have been presented: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." To be chosen as the instrument of a universal blessing was no small favor. It was enough to fill the ambition of the noblest mind. What this blessing consisted in, and how it has been, or will be conferred, will appear in the sequel.

In his journeyings Abram took Lot, his nephew, with him. And while they sojourned as strangers in the land of promise, their possessions multiplied exceedingly, so that strife arose between Abram's herdsmen and those of Lot. This led to a manifestation of the nobility of Abram's character. Well knowing the strife among the servants, if allowed to continue, would culminate in a quarrel between the masters, he proposed a peaceful separation, where conflicting interests forbade the continuance of the union of many years. Nor did he take advantage of the fact that both his divine call, and his age, gave him the undoubted right of choice; but he simply referred Lot to the two natural divisions of the land, and desired him to make a selection. And Lot beheld the valley of the Jordan, like "the garden of the Lord" for beauty and fertility, and, with selfishness which appears the more inexcusable in contrast with Abram's generosity, he chose the best portion of the land, and "pitched his tent toward Sodom." But his selfish choice proved a curse. His family were corrupted by the wickedness of the inhabitants; and he finally lost his all, and with his two daughters, escaped, with life only, to the mountains.

[1] Gen. 12: 1-3.

On the other hand, Abram's sacrifice brought a blessing. The good news was preached to him as follows:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise walk through the land, in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."[1]

"In this promise, as well as in the one previously quoted, the gospel was obscurely, but none the less truly, preached to Abram: for we understand its fulfillment to involve the three following things: (1) *The resurrection of the dead,* (2) *The gift of immortality to Abraham and his seed,* (3) *An eternal inheritance by them of this earth.* Whether or not these deductions are legitimate, will be seen in the progress of the argument.

We now call the reader's attention to a remarkable covenant, given as a pledge of the promise just quoted, and recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, as follows:

[1] Gen. 13: 14-17.

are received we must grow in both grace and knowledge of the truth.

Leaving, then, the question of the amount of knowledge essential to salvation, let us inquire when and where the gospel was preached to Abraham, and in what it consisted. And that we may be clearly understood, we remark, that Abraham received two great promises, the one relating to temporal, the other to eternal things; the one to be fulfilled in time, the other in eternity; the former the pledge, or the assurance of the latter. These promises stand related to each other as shadow and substance, as type and antitype. The first and lesser promise was given that we who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel might find strong consolation in the record of God's dealings in the past, because of the assurance it gives of the faithfulness of him who has promised. Finding all that relates to the temporal fulfilled not only to the letter, but in jot and tittle, faith has a sure foundation for confidence, and while we hope for the eternal things which as yet we see not, still do we with patience wait for them.

The first mention we find of Abraham, beyond the bare record of his existence and genealogy, is in the following language:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee; and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families [peoples or nations] of the earth be blessed."[1]

In obedience to this divine call, Abram (for his name had not yet received the significant change) went forth, not knowing whither he went, but intent upon obeying the Lord. And truly no higher motive for obedience could have been presented: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." To be chosen as the instrument of a universal blessing was no small favor. It was enough to fill the ambition of the noblest mind. What this blessing consisted in, and how it has been, or will be conferred, will appear in the sequel.

In his journeyings Abram took Lot, his nephew, with him. And while they sojourned as strangers in the land of promise, their possessions multiplied exceedingly, so that strife arose between Abram's herdsmen and those of Lot. This led to a manifestation of the nobility of Abram's character. Well knowing the strife among the servants, if allowed to continue, would culminate in a quarrel between the masters, he proposed a peaceful separation, where conflicting interests forbade the continuance of the union of many years. Nor did he take advantage of the fact that both his divine call, and his age, gave him the undoubted right of choice; but he simply referred Lot to the two natural divisions of the land, and desired him to make a selection. And Lot beheld the valley of the Jordan, like "the garden of the Lord" for beauty and fertility, and, with selfishness which appears the more inexcusable in contrast with Abram's generosity, he chose the best portion of the land, and "pitched his tent toward Sodom." But his selfish choice proved a curse. His family were corrupted by the wickedness of the inhabitants; and he finally lost his all, and with his two daughters, escaped, with life only, to the mountains.

[1] Gen. 12: 1-3.

On the other hand, Abram's sacrifice brought a blessing. The good news was preached to him as follows:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise walk through the land, in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."[1]

"In this promise, as well as in the one previously quoted, the gospel was obscurely, but none the less truly, preached to Abram: for we understand its fulfillment to involve the three following things: (1) *The resurrection of the dead,* (2) *The gift of immortality to Abraham and his seed,* (3) *An eternal inheritance by them of this earth.* Whether or not these deductions are legitimate, will be seen in the progress of the argument.

We now call the reader's attention to a remarkable covenant, given as a pledge of the promise just quoted, and recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, as follows:

[1] Gen. 13: 14-17.

are received we must grow in both grace and knowledge of the truth.

Leaving, then, the question of the amount of knowledge essential to salvation, let us inquire when and where the gospel was preached to Abraham, and in what it consisted. And that we may be clearly understood, we remark, that Abraham received two great promises, the one relating to temporal, the other to eternal things; the one to be fulfilled in time, the other in eternity; the former the pledge, or the assurance of the latter. These promises stand related to each other as shadow and substance, as type and antitype. The first and lesser promise was given that we who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel might find strong consolation in the record of God's dealings in the past, because of the assurance it gives of the faithfulness of him who has promised. Finding all that relates to the temporal fulfilled not only to the letter, but in jot and tittle, faith has a sure foundation for confidence, and while we hope for the eternal things which as yet we see not, still do we with patience wait for them.

The first mention we find of Abraham, beyond the bare record of his existence and genealogy, is in the following language:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee; and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families [peoples or nations] of the earth be blessed."[1]

In obedience to this divine call, Abram (for his name had not yet received the significant change) went forth, not knowing whither he went, but intent upon obeying the Lord. And truly no higher motive for obedience could have been presented: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." To be chosen as the instrument of a universal blessing was no small favor. It was enough to fill the ambition of the noblest mind. What this blessing consisted in, and how it has been, or will be conferred, will appear in the sequel.

In his journeyings Abram took Lot, his nephew, with him. And while they sojourned as strangers in the land of promise, their possessions multiplied exceedingly, so that strife arose between Abram's herdsmen and those of Lot. This led to a manifestation of the nobility of Abram's character. Well knowing the strife among the servants, if allowed to continue, would culminate in a quarrel between the masters, he proposed a peaceful separation, where conflicting interests forbade the continuance of the union of many years. Nor did he take advantage of the fact that both his divine call, and his age, gave him the undoubted right of choice; but he simply referred Lot to the two natural divisions of the land, and desired him to make a selection. And Lot beheld the valley of the Jordan, like "the garden of the Lord" for beauty and fertility, and, with selfishness which appears the more inexcusable in contrast with Abram's generosity, he chose the best portion of the land, and "pitched his tent toward Sodom." But his selfish choice proved a curse. His family were corrupted by the wickedness of the inhabitants; and he finally lost his all, and with his two daughters, escaped, with life only, to the mountains.

[1] Gen. 12: 1-3.

On the other hand, Abram's sacrifice brought a blessing. The good news was preached to him as follows:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise walk through the land, in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."[1]

"In this promise, as well as in the one previously quoted, the gospel was obscurely, but none the less truly, preached to Abram: for we understand its fulfillment to involve the three following things: (1) *The resurrection of the dead*, (2) *The gift of immortality to Abraham and his seed*, (3) *An eternal inheritance by them of this earth.* Whether or not these deductions are legitimate, will be seen in the progress of the argument.

We now call the reader's attention to a remarkable covenant, given as a pledge of the promise just quoted, and recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, as follows:

[1] Gen. 13: 14-17.

are received we must grow in both grace and knowledge of the truth.

Leaving, then, the question of the amount of knowledge essential to salvation, let us inquire when and where the gospel was preached to Abraham, and in what it consisted. And that we may be clearly understood, we remark, that Abraham received two great promises, the one relating to temporal, the other to eternal things; the one to be fulfilled in time, the other in eternity; the former the pledge, or the assurance of the latter. These promises stand related to each other as shadow and substance, as type and antitype. The first and lesser promise was given that we who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel might find strong consolation in the record of God's dealings in the past, because of the assurance it gives of the faithfulness of him who has promised. Finding all that relates to the temporal fulfilled not only to the letter, but in jot and tittle, faith has a sure foundation for confidence, and while we hope for the eternal things which as yet we see not, still do we with patience wait for them.

The first mention we find of Abraham, beyond the bare record of his existence and genealogy, is in the following language:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee; and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families [peoples or nations] of the earth be blessed."[1]

In obedience to this divine call, Abram (for his name had not yet received the significant change) went forth, not knowing whither he went, but intent upon obeying the Lord. And truly no higher motive for obedience could have been presented: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." To be chosen as the instrument of a universal blessing was no small favor. It was enough to fill the ambition of the noblest mind. What this blessing consisted in, and how it has been, or will be conferred, will appear in the sequel.

In his journeyings Abram took Lot, his nephew, with him. And while they sojourned as strangers in the land of promise, their possessions multiplied exceedingly, so that strife arose between Abram's herdsmen and those of Lot. This led to a manifestation of the nobility of Abram's character. Well knowing the strife among the servants, if allowed to continue, would culminate in a quarrel between the masters, he proposed a peaceful separation, where conflicting interests forbade the continuance of the union of many years. Nor did he take advantage of the fact that both his divine call, and his age, gave him the undoubted right of choice; but he simply referred Lot to the two natural divisions of the land, and desired him to make a selection. And Lot beheld the valley of the Jordan, like "the garden of the Lord" for beauty and fertility, and, with selfishness which appears the more inexcusable in contrast with Abram's generosity, he chose the best portion of the land, and "pitched his tent toward Sodom." But his selfish choice proved a curse. His family were corrupted by the wickedness of the inhabitants; and he finally lost his all, and with his two daughters, escaped, with life only, to the mountains.

[1] Gen. 12: 1-3.

On the other hand, Abram's sacrifice brought a blessing. The good news was preached to him as follows:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise walk through the land, in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."[1]

"In this promise, as well as in the one previously quoted, the gospel was obscurely, but none the less truly, preached to Abram: for we understand its fulfillment to involve the three following things: (1) *The resurrection of the dead*, (2) *The gift of immortality to Abraham and his seed*, (3) *An eternal inheritance by them of this earth.* Whether or not these deductions are legitimate, will be seen in the progress of the argument.

We now call the reader's attention to a remarkable covenant, given as a pledge of the promise just quoted, and recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, as follows:

[1] Gen. 13: 14-17.

ABRAM'S 'WHEREBY.'

"After these things, the word of Jehovah came to Abram, in vision, saying: Fear not, Abram. I am a shield to thee; thy reward is exceeding great. And Abram said: Lord Jehovah, what wilt thou give me? For I go childless; and the heir of my house, he is Eliezer of Damascus. And Abram said: Behold, to me thou hast not given seed; and behold, one of my household will be my heir. And behold, the word of Jehovah came to him, saying: This shall not be thy heir; but one that shall come forth from thine own bowels, he shall be thy heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said: Look now toward heaven, and number the stars, if thou shalt be able to number them. And he said: So shall be thy seed. And he believed in Jehovah; and he reckoned it to him for righteousness.

"And he said to him: I am Jehovah, who brought thee out from Ur of the Chaldæans, to give thee this land to possess it.

"And he said: Lord Jehovah, whereby shall I know that I shall possess it?

"And he said to him: Take for me a heifer three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon. And he took to him all these; and he divided them in the midst, and laid each one's part over against its fellow; but the birds he did not divide.

"And birds of prey came down upon the carcasses; and Abram drove them away. And the sun was about going down, and a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and behold, a horror of great darkness falling upon him. And he said to Abram: Know surely, that thy seed shall be a sojourner in a land that is not theirs, and will serve them; and they will afflict them four hundred years. And the nation which they will serve I judge; and afterward they shall come out with great substance. And as for thee, thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. And in the fourth generation they shall return hither. For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full. And the sun was gone down, and darkness came on. And behold, a furnace of smoke and fiery flame, that passed between those pieces.

"On that day did Jehovah make a covenant with Abram, saying: To thy seed I give this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates; the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." [1]

In this chapter Abram asks and receives a pledge, which we may call *Abram's "whereby:"* for after God had renewed the promise concerning his seed and his inheritance of the land, he

[1] Bible Union Trans.

said, "Lord God, WHEREBY shall I know that I shall inherit it?" In answer to this question, the Lord commands Abram to prepare the slaughtered animals, as he would for a covenant with another man. He then makes a covenant with Abram concerning his seed only—Abram himself not being included in it—as a surety of the greater promise, relating to Abraham *and* his seed.

One of the items of this "whereby" declares that Abram is to "go to his fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age." We conclude, therefore, that the promises to him were not to be fulfilled in this state of mortality. This inference is confirmed by the apostle Paul, who says,[1] that when Abram was called to go out into a place he should after receive for an inheritance, he obeyed; and by faith sojourned in the land of promise *as in a strange country*, as did also Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him to the same promise. For he looked for a city built and made by God. These, with countless others, died in faith, *not having received the promises;* but confessed themselves strangers and pilgrims upon the earth. Yet they declared plainly they *sought a country*, and desired a better country, *even a heavenly:* "Wherefore," says the record, "God is not ashamed to be called their God [because they had faith in his promise, through Abram, of a country]: for he hath prepared for them a city," as Abraham expected. And Paul continues the long list of worthies, including those who "were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection," and concludes by saying that these all, from Abel down, having obtained a good report through faith, *received not* the fulfillment of the promise, "God having provided some better thing for us, "that they *without us should not be made perfect.*"

Our conclusion from the record that the promise to Abram *and* his seed related to the immortal and not to the mortal state, thus confirmed, is still further strengthened, or we may say is established as truth by the testimony of Stephen,[2] who declares explicitly that Abraham received no inheritance whatever in this earth. "For he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on. Yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." So it appears that all the estate Abraham ever held in this world was the common inheritance of Adam's children—a burial place.

[1] Heb. 11: 8, 16. [2] Acts 7: 1-5.

UMI

ABRAM'S 'WHEREBY.'

"After these things, the word of Jehovah came to Abram, in vision, saying: Fear not, Abram. I am a shield to thee; thy reward is exceeding great. And Abram said: Lord Jehovah, what wilt thou give me? For I go childless; and the heir of my house, he is Eliezer of Damascus. And Abram said: Behold, to me thou hast not given seed; and behold, one of my household will be my heir. And behold, the word of Jehovah came to him, saying: This shall not be thy heir; but one that shall come forth from thine own bowels, he shall be thy heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said: Look now toward heaven, and number the stars, if thou shalt be able to number them. And he said: So shall be thy seed. And he believed in Jehovah; and he reckoned it to him for righteousness.

"And he said to him: I am Jehovah, who brought thee out from Ur of the Chaldæans, to give thee this land to possess it.

"And he said: Lord Jehovah, whereby shall I know that I shall possess it?

"And he said to him: Take for me a heifer three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon. And he took to him all these; and he divided them in the midst, and laid each one's part over against its fellow; but the birds he did not divide.

"And birds of prey came down upon the carcasses; and Abram drove them away. And the sun was about going down, and a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and behold, a horror of great darkness falling upon him. And he said to Abram: Know surely, that thy seed shall be a sojourner in a land that is not theirs, and will serve them; and they will afflict them four hundred years. And the nation which they will serve I judge; and afterward they shall come out with great substance. And as for thee, thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. And in the fourth generation they shall return hither. For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full. And the sun was gone down, and darkness came on. And behold, a furnace of smoke and fiery flame, that passed between those pieces.

"On that day did Jehovah make a covenant with Abram, saying: To thy seed I give this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates; the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." [1]

In this chapter Abram asks and receives a pledge, which we may call *Abram's "whereby:"* for after God had renewed the promise concerning his seed and his inheritance of the land, he

[1] Bible Union Trans.

said, "Lord God, WHEREBY shall I know that I shall inherit it?" In answer to this question, the Lord commands Abram to prepare the slaughtered animals, as he would for a covenant with another man. He then makes a covenant with Abram concerning his seed only—Abram himself not being included in it—as a surety of the greater promise, relating to Abraham *and* his seed.

One of the items of this "whereby" declares that Abram is to "go to his fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age." We conclude, therefore, that the promises to him were not to be fulfilled in this state of mortality. This inference is confirmed by the apostle Paul, who says,[1] that when Abram was called to go out into a place he should after receive for an inheritance, he obeyed; and by faith sojourned in the land of promise *as in a strange country*, as did also Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him to the same promise. For he looked for a city built and made by God. These, with countless others, died in faith, *not having received the promises;* but confessed themselves strangers and pilgrims upon the earth. Yet they declared plainly they *sought a country*, and desired a better country, *even a heavenly:* "Wherefore," says the record, "God is not ashamed to be called their God [because they had faith in his promise, through Abram, of a country]: for he hath prepared for them a city," as Abraham expected. And Paul continues the long list of worthies, including those who "were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection," and concludes by saying that these all, from Abel down, having obtained a good report through faith, *received not* the fulfillment of the promise, "God having provided some better thing for us, "that they *without us should not be made perfect.*"

Our conclusion from the record that the promise to Abram *and* his seed related to the immortal and not to the mortal state, thus confirmed, is still further strengthened, or we may say is established as truth by the testimony of Stephen,[2] who declares explicitly that Abraham received no inheritance whatever in this earth. "For he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on. Yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." So it appears that all the estate Abraham ever held in this world was the common inheritance of Adam's children—a burial place.

[1] Heb. 11: 8, 16. [2] Acts 7: 1-5.

UMI

Now as God has promised an inheritance here on earth to Abraham, he must receive it, or the promise of God will fail. As God's promise cannot fail, and as Abraham is dead, it follows that he must have a resurrection in order to receive the promise. And as the inheritance is promised to him "forever,"[1] it must be a resurrection to immortality.

It is not claimed that this reasoning is either original or new. It originated in the Scriptures, and was well known to the fathers, albeit it has fallen into disuse in this spiritualizing age. Says Henry Dana Ward:

"I confirm this view of the promise made unto the fathers by certain opinions of learned Rabbis, going to show that they also received the promise in the sense it is expounded here. The promise is of the inheritance of the land *forever*. Rabbi Eleazar, who lived just after the second temple was built, writes thus: 'As I live, saith the Lord, I will awake you hereafter in the resurrection of the dead, and will gather you with all Israel into the land of Israel.'

"Jonathan the Paraphrast, who lived before the Christian Era, says on Hos. 14: 8, 'They shall be gathered from their captivity; they shall live under the shadow of Messiah; the dead shall rise, and good shall increase in the earth,' &c.

"'Where does the [Mosaic] law teach the resurrection of the dead? Truly, where it says (Ex. 6: 4), "And I have also established my covenant with them, *that I will give to them* the land of Canaan:" for it is said not to *you* but to *them*. Again, the Sadducees asked Rabbi Gamaliel [Paul's teacher] whence he could prove that God would raise the dead. Nor would they rest, until he had brought them this verse (Deut. 11: 21), "*Which land the Lord swear to your fathers that he would give* THEM."' God covenanted with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to give *them* the land in which they were strangers, for an inheritance; and not having received the inheritance, *they* must needs live again, or in respect to *them* the promise has failed, which is impossible.

"'Rabbi Kimchi, on Obadiah, says, When Rome shall be laid waste, there shall be redemption for Israel. And on Is. 26: 19, The holy blessed God will raise the dead at the time of deliverance. And on Jer. 23: 20, In that he saith *ye* shall consider it, and not *they* shall consider it, he intimateth the resurrection.'

"Dr. Gill furnishes the following (1 Cor. 15: 54): 'When the King Messiah comes, the holy blessed God will raise up those that sleep, as it is written, He shall swallow up death in victory.'

"On Matt. 22: 31, 'The holy blessed God promised to our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that he would give *them* the land of Israel. We learn from hence that they shall be raised, and that God will hereafter give them the land of Israel.'

"It will greatly increase our interest in the prophets, if we observe, from Moses to Malachi, that the promises and threatenings are directly to you and to us, who read and hear, and not to *them* who may come after us. In all the glorious prophecies of Israel's restoration, scattered up and down the sacred page, the word is to *you*, and is not to *them*; the word is spoken to *you* in the second, and not to *them* in the third person: and in order to be fulfilled to the persons to whom it has in past ages been spoken, they must revive, and come out of the grave, and live again; which assuredly they will at the coming and kingdom of Christ in the resurrection of the dead."[1]

But the pledge, or "whereby," of Gen. 15 demands a more extended consideration than we have given it; for it was not intended for Abram alone, but is one of the things which were written aforetime for our learning; that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope;[2] for it will be observed that the items of this pledge only began to be fulfilled in Abraham's day; and his death in a good old age was even one of them. And if, as we have remarked, the covenant of this chapter is given as a pledge, to be fulfilled in a state of mortality, of the greater and better covenant, which can only be realized in the immortal state, when all God's people shall be made perfect,[3] if we can find that it has been fulfilled item by item to the letter, it will be the strongest possible assurance that the exceeding great and precious promises partially shadowed in it, will be also duly received.

In answer to Abram's question, "Whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" as we have observed, God commands Abram to prepare a sacrifice, according to a long prevalent custom. The animals were divided, the parts laid the one over against the other, and the party or parties making the covenant passed between the pieces, thus invoking upon themselves in case of failure the fate of the sacrificial victims.[4] In this case it should be observed that this is not a covenant between God and Abram, but is *God's covenant with* Abram.[5]

As the sun went down, a deep sleep, and horror of great darkness, fell upon Abram, signifying that he must pass through the

[1] Gen. 13: 15.

[1] *Hope of the Church*, note, pp. 8, 10. [2] Rom. 15: 4. [3] Heb. 11: 40. [4] See Jer. 34: 18-20. [5] See Gal. 3: 20.

Now as God has promised an inheritance here on earth to Abraham, he must receive it, or the promise of God will fail. As God's promise cannot fail, and as Abraham is dead, it follows that he must have a resurrection in order to receive the promise. And as the inheritance is promised to him "forever,"[1] it must be a resurrection to immortality.

It is not claimed that this reasoning is either original or new. It originated in the Scriptures, and was well known to the fathers, albeit it has fallen into disuse in this spiritualizing age. Says Henry Dana Ward:

"I confirm this view of the promise made unto the fathers by certain opinions of learned Rabbis, going to show that they also received the promise in the sense it is expounded here. The promise is of the inheritance of the land *forever*. Rabbi Eleazar, who lived just after the second temple was built, writes thus: 'As I live, saith the Lord, I will awake you hereafter in the resurrection of the dead, and will gather you with all Israel into the land of Israel.'

"Jonathan the Paraphrast, who lived before the Christian Era, says on Hos. 14: 8, 'They shall be gathered from their captivity; they shall live under the shadow of Messiah; the dead shall rise, and good shall increase in the earth,' &c.

"'Where does the [Mosaic] law teach the resurrection of the dead? Truly, where it says (Ex. 6: 4), "And I have also established my covenant with them, *that I will give to them* the land of Canaan:" for it is said not to *you* but to *them*. Again, the Sadducees asked Rabbi Gamaliel [Paul's teacher] whence he could prove that God would raise the dead. Nor would they rest, until he had brought them this verse (Deut. 11: 21), "*Which land the Lord swear to your fathers that he would give* THEM."' God covenanted with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to give *them* the land in which they were strangers, for an inheritance; and not having received the inheritance, *they* must needs live again, or in respect to *them* the promise has failed, which is impossible.

"'Rabbi Kimchi, on Obadiah, says, When Rome shall be laid waste, there shall be redemption for Israel. And on Is. 26: 19, The holy blessed God will raise the dead at the time of deliverance. And on Jer. 23: 20, In that he saith *ye* shall consider it, and not *they* shall consider it, he intimateth the resurrection.'

"Dr. Gill furnishes the following (1 Cor. 15: 54): 'When the King Messiah comes, the holy blessed God will raise up those that sleep, as it is written, He shall swallow up death in victory.'

"On Matt. 22: 31, 'The holy blessed God promised to our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that he would give *them* the land of Israel. We learn from hence that they shall be raised, and that God will hereafter give them the land of Israel.'

"It will greatly increase our interest in the prophets, if we observe, from Moses to Malachi, that the promises and threatenings are directly to you and to us, who read and hear, and not to *them* who may come after us. In all the glorious prophecies of Israel's restoration, scattered up and down the sacred page, the word is to *you*, and is not to *them*; the word is spoken to *you* in the second, and not to *them* in the third person: and in order to be fulfilled to the persons to whom it has in past ages been spoken, they must revive, and come out of the grave, and live again; which assuredly they will at the coming and kingdom of Christ in the resurrection of the dead."[1]

But the pledge, or "whereby," of Gen. 15 demands a more extended consideration than we have given it; for it was not intended for Abram alone, but is one of the things which were written aforetime for our learning; that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope;[2] for it will be observed that the items of this pledge only began to be fulfilled in Abraham's day; and his death in a good old age was even one of them. And if, as we have remarked, the covenant of this chapter is given as a pledge, to be fulfilled in a state of mortality, of the greater and better covenant, which can only be realized in the immortal state, when all God's people shall be made perfect,[3] if we can find that it has been fulfilled item by item to the letter, it will be the strongest possible assurance that the exceeding great and precious promises partially shadowed in it, will be also duly received.

In answer to Abram's question, "Whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" as we have observed, God commands Abram to prepare a sacrifice, according to a long prevalent custom. The animals were divided, the parts laid the one over against the other, and the party or parties making the covenant passed between the pieces, thus invoking upon themselves in case of failure the fate of the sacrificial victims.[4] In this case it should be observed that this is not a covenant between God and Abram, but is *God's covenant with* Abram.[5]

As the sun went down, a deep sleep, and horror of great darkness, fell upon Abram, signifying that he must pass through the

[1] Gen. 13: 15.

[1] *Hope of the Church*, note, pp. 8, 10. [2] Rom. 15: 4. [3] Heb. 11: 40. [4] See Jer. 34: 18-20. [5] See Gal. 3: 20.

state of death to the realization of his inheritance. Then God said:

"Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them: and they shall afflict them four hundred years."

There has been some dispute concerning the fulfillment of this passage. That his seed continued pilgrims and strangers till the time of Moses none dispute; but some have applied the period of four hundred years to the Egyptian bondage alone, while others have regarded it as a "round number," covering all the time of the sojourn from the call of Abram to the exodus. The true application is to *the seed* of Abraham; and the date of its commencement is the mocking of Ishmael at the weaning of Isaac, ending with the four hundred and thirty years of Gal. 3: 17, at the exodus.[1]

"And that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge."

The fulfillment of this prediction in the Egyptian plagues has passed into a proverb. The water turned to blood, the frogs, the lice, the flies, the slaughter of the cattle, the blains and boils, the hail, the locusts, the darkness to be felt, the death of the first born, and finally the destruction of Pharaoh and his hosts, form a chapter of judgments without parallel.

"They shall come out with great substance."

The record tersely says, "They spoiled the Egyptians."

[1] The *Samaritan* Pentateuch, in all its manuscripts and printed copies, reads the place thus: *U moshab beney Yishrael veabotam asher yashebu baarets Cenaan ubaarets mitzraim sheloshim shanah vearba meoth shanah.*

"*Now the sojourning of the children of Israel*, and of their fathers, *which they sojourned* in the land of Canaan, and *in the land of Egypt*, *was* 430."

The same sum is given by St. Paul (Gal. 3: 17), who reckons from the promise made to Abraham, when God commanded him to go to Canaan, to the giving of the law, which soon followed the departure from Egypt; and this chronology of the apostle is concordant with the Samaritan Pentateuch, which, by preserving the two passages, *they and their fathers*, and *in the land of Canaan*, which are lost out of the present copies of the Hebrew text, has rescued this passage from all obscurity and contradiction. It may be necessary to observe, that the Alexandrian copy of the Septuagint has the same reading as that in the Samaritan. The Samaritan Pentateuch is allowed by many learned men to exhibit the most correct copy of the five books of Moses; and the Alexandrian copy of the Septuagint must also be allowed to be one of the most authentic, as well as most ancient copies of this *version* which we possess. As to St. Paul, no man will dispute the authenticity of his statement; and thus in the mouth of these three most respectable witnesses, the whole account is indubitably established. That these three witnesses have the truth, the chronology itself proves; for, from Abraham's entry into Canaan to the birth of Isaac was 25 years. (Gen. 12: 4; 17: 1-21.) Isaac was 60 years old at the birth of Jacob. (Gen. 25: 26.) And Jacob was 130 at his going down into Egypt (Gen. 47: 9), which three sums make 215 years. And then Jacob and his children having continued in Egypt 215 years more, the whole sum of 430 years is regularly completed.—Dr. Clarke on Ex. 12: 40, 41.

"Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

We are told: "And these are the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived: a hundred and threescore and fifteen years. Then Abraham gave up the ghost,[1] and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people.[2] Though not an aged man as compared with his fathers, he was an old man in his own generation. The words "of years" do not occur in the original. The sense is rather, old, and *satisfied* with life.

"In the fourth generation they shall come hither again."

This passage is explained by the previous term given to the wanderings of Abram's seed—four hundred years. This time expired, they were to return.

At this point in the record, it is stated that "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between the pieces," as the visible token of "the invisible God," and by this act "in the same day God made a covenant with Abram saying: UNTO THY SEED have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: the Kenites, the Kennizzites, the Kadmonites, the Hittites, the Perrizzites, the Rephaims, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Girgashites, and the Jebusites."

That this is a distinct promise from that recorded in ch. 13, and referred to in the first verses of ch. 15, must be apparent to even a casual reader. In the one case the parties receiving the prom-

[1] By "giving up the ghost" we now understand giving up his spirit, as by "ghost" we usually suppose "spirit" to be meant. We doubt if the translators intended it to bear this sense; but apprehend that they rather meant it to express the giving up the breath of life, or *breathing out* one's life, which is the true meaning. It is there simply equivalent to the modern and usual phrase, "he expired." The term is thought by Jewish writers to express death by old age only, without previous sickness or pain. This is the kind of death which results from the natural dissolution of the body, when the radical heat and moisture by degrees dry up and wear away. Such a kind of death was that *euthanasia*, that good and easy departure, which was greatly desired by the ancients, and which was indeed desirable, when old age was really venerated, and treated with solicitude and respect—with far more of both than, we fear, it finds under the influences and activities of modern civilization. This kind of death, this gentle sliding out of life, had been promised to Abraham as a blessing. "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace. Thou shalt be buried in a good old age." (Gen. 15: 15.) And we are now informed that this took place, to show that there was no point, however comparatively inconsiderable, in which the promises of God were left unfulfilled.—Kitto. *Bible Illustrations*, pp. 274-5. These remarks are confirmed by Dr. Adam Clarke's able note on this passage, and by the Bible Union and other translations. Lange, Am. Ed., gives "*breathed out*" as the literal rendering of the Hebrew word *gawah*.

[2] As the writer proposes an article for THE QUARTERLY upon this point, he will here only refer the reader to Josh. 24: 2, 14, 15, which passages declare Abraham's fathers to have been idolaters, and give us the key to the call of Abram unto a strange land "out from" his kindred. Those who claim that this expression teaches a conscious intermediate state, will find an insuperable objection to their theory in these passages. We do not remember to have seen it grappled with by any advocate of the conscious intermediate state. There are yet other difficulties, which destroy the Immaterialist's claim to this passage, which will be presented at large hereafter.

state of death to the realization of his inheritance. Then God said:

"Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them: and they shall afflict them four hundred years."

There has been some dispute concerning the fulfillment of this passage. That his seed continued pilgrims and strangers till the time of Moses none dispute; but some have applied the period of four hundred years to the Egyptian bondage alone, while others have regarded it as a "round number," covering all the time of the sojourn from the call of Abram to the exodus. The true application is to *the seed* of Abraham; and the date of its commencement is the mocking of Ishmael at the weaning of Isaac, ending with the four hundred and thirty years of Gal. 3: 17, at the exodus.[1]

"And that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge."

The fulfillment of this prediction in the Egyptian plagues has passed into a proverb. The water turned to blood, the frogs, the lice, the flies, the slaughter of the cattle, the blains and boils, the hail, the locusts, the darkness to be felt, the death of the first born, and finally the destruction of Pharaoh and his hosts, form a chapter of judgments without parallel.

"They shall come out with great substance."

The record tersely says, "They spoiled the Egyptians."

[1] The *Samaritan* Pentateuch, in all its manuscripts and printed copies, reads the place thus: *U moshab beney Yishrael veabotam asher yashebu baarets Cenaan ubaarets mitzraim sheloshim shanah vearba meoth shanah.*

"*Now the sojourning of the children of Israel*, and of their fathers, *which they sojourned* in the land of Canaan, and *in the land of Egypt*, *was* 430."

The same sum is given by St. Paul (Gal. 3: 17), who reckons from the promise made to Abraham, when God commanded him to go to Canaan, to the giving of the law, which soon followed the departure from Egypt; and this chronology of the apostle is concordant with the Samaritan Pentateuch, which, by preserving the two passages, *they and their fathers*, and *in the land of Canaan*, which are lost out of the present copies of the Hebrew text, has rescued this passage from all obscurity and contradiction. It may be necessary to observe, that the Alexandrian copy of the Septuagint has the same reading as that in the Samaritan. The Samaritan Pentateuch is allowed by many learned men to exhibit the most correct copy of the five books of Moses; and the Alexandrian copy of the Septuagint must also be allowed to be one of the most authentic, as well as most ancient copies of this *version* which we possess. As to St. Paul, no man will dispute the authenticity of his statement; and thus in the mouth of these three most respectable witnesses, the whole account is indubitably established. That these three witnesses have the truth, the chronology itself proves; for, from Abraham's entry into Canaan to the birth of Isaac was 25 years. (Gen. 12: 4; 17: 1-21.) Isaac was 60 years old at the birth of Jacob. (Gen. 25: 26.) And Jacob was 130 at his going down into Egypt (Gen. 47: 9), which three sums make 215 years. And then Jacob and his children having continued in Egypt 215 years more, the whole sum of 430 years is regularly completed.—Dr. Clarke on Ex. 12: 40, 41.

"Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

We are told: "And these are the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived: a hundred and threescore and fifteen years. Then Abraham gave up the ghost,[1] and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people.[2] Though not an aged man as compared with his fathers, he was an old man in his own generation. The words "of years" do not occur in the original. The sense is rather, old, and *satisfied* with life.

"In the fourth generation they shall come hither again."

This passage is explained by the previous term given to the wanderings of Abram's seed—four hundred years. This time expired, they were to return.

At this point in the record, it is stated that "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between the pieces," as the visible token of "the invisible God," and by this act "in the same day God made a covenant with Abram saying: UNTO THY SEED have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: the Kenites, the Kennizzites, the Kadmonites, the Hittites, the Perrizzites, the Rephaims, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Girgashites, and the Jebusites."

That this is a distinct promise from that recorded in ch. 13, and referred to in the first verses of ch. 15, must be apparent to even a casual reader. In the one case the parties receiving the prom-

[1] By "giving up the ghost" we now understand giving up his spirit, as by "ghost" we usually suppose "spirit" to be meant. We doubt if the translators intended it to bear this sense; but apprehend that they rather meant it to express the giving up the breath of life, or *breathing out* one's life, which is the true meaning. It is there simply equivalent to the modern and usual phrase, "he expired." The term is thought by Jewish writers to express death by old age only, without previous sickness or pain. This is the kind of death which results from the natural dissolution of the body, when the radical heat and moisture by degrees dry up and wear away. Such a kind of death was that *euthanasia*, that good and easy departure, which was greatly desired by the ancients, and which was indeed desirable, when old age was really venerated, and treated with solicitude and respect—with far more of both than, we fear, it finds under the influences and activities of modern civilization. This kind of death, this gentle sliding out of life, had been promised to Abraham as a blessing. "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace. Thou shalt be buried in a good old age." (Gen. 15: 15.) And we are now informed that this took place, to show that there was no point, however comparatively inconsiderable, in which the promises of God were left unfulfilled.—Kitto. *Bible Illustrations*, pp. 274-5. These remarks are confirmed by Dr. Adam Clarke's able note on this passage, and by the Bible Union and other translations. Lange, Am. Ed., gives "*breathed out*" as the literal rendering of the Hebrew word *gawah*.

[2] As the writer proposes an article for THE QUARTERLY upon this point, he will here only refer the reader to Josh. 24: 2, 14, 15, which passages declare Abraham's fathers to have been idolaters, and give us the key to the call of Abram unto a strange land "out from" his kindred. Those who claim that this expression teaches a conscious intermediate state, will find an insuperable objection to their theory in these passages. We do not remember to have seen it grappled with by any advocate of the conscious intermediate state. There are yet other difficulties, which destroy the Immaterialist's claim to this passage, which will be presented at large hereafter.

ise are *Abram* AND *his seed:* "To thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." While in the second promise, the pledge and type of the first, Abram is excluded—"*Unto thy seed* have I given this land"—which agrees with Stephen's testimony, already referred to, that Abram received as an inheritance not enough to set his foot upon.

Another point of difference is even more striking. In ch. 13, Abram is told to "look northward, southward, eastward, and westward." Now the idea lying upon the face of this language is *boundlessness.* It will not do to assert that the words, "all the land that *thou seest*," limit the expression, and confine this promise to the land of Canaan; because such a claim proves too much. If the words, "all thou seest," are to be taken strictly literally, they cannot include all the land of Canaan; because he could not literally see it all. They are evidently used to carry out the idea of the preceding language, boundlessness; area in general, with no specified bounds. And that this is the correct understanding of the language will appear hereafter.

On the other hand, in the covenant of ch. 15, the land is carefully bounded, as between two well-known rivers; and that there may be no mistake, the nations then occupying the territory are mentioned by name.

We also remark that the covenant of ch. 15 is proved to be *conditional;* while that of ch. 13 is strictly *unconditional.* A vital difference.

Having seen the accomplishment of all the other items of Abram's "whereby," we now inquire, Has this, the last and most important of all, been duly fulfilled? We hope not to weary our readers by the abundance of testimony on this subject; for we propose to give ample proof that it is fulfilled, fully and forever, though we cannot within the limits of an article like this transcribe all the evidence we have on this point.

It is not contended that the original covenants, or promises, and the first allusions to them, are in themselves perfectly clear. They are often obscure, and, like other prophecies, purposely so. They are sometimes mingled, as the painter mingles the objects of a landscape in his first outlines upon the canvass: but as his subsequent skillful touches bring out the perspective, and assign each object its relative position, so subsequent revelation assigns

type and antitype, shadow and substance, to their respective ages with a precision that need not be mistaken.[1]

When the time drew near for Joseph to die, he called his brethren together and took an oath of them, as Jacob had previously taken of him, that they would carry up his bones into Canaan, when God should bring them out of Egypt into the land he swear to give to their fathers. After his decease the troubles of the Israelites began to increase; and while their afflictions were multiplying, the iniquity of the Amorites was filling up.[2] At last the time drew nigh for God to fulfill the covenant he had made with their fathers concerning them—the prophetic period of four hundred years was about run out, and the thrilling narrative of the Exodus begins. At the burning bush God reveals to Moses his purpose concerning Israel, thus:

"I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey: unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites."

The allusion to Gen. 15 in this language is too plain to be misunderstood; as it is, also, in the succeeding verses:

"Go, and gather the elders of Israel together, and say unto them, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, appeared unto me saying, I have surely visited you, and seen that which is done to you in Egypt: and I have said, I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt unto the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, unto a land flowing with milk and honey."[3]

After the Exodus, there are continued allusions to its object as being that they might go up to possess the land of Canaan in accordance with the promise or covenant made with Abraham. We quote some passages as samples:

"And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee into the land

[1] Thus we find the land of Canaan sometimes spoken of in the Old Testament as the heritage of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But when the clear light of the Gospel shines, we have no more such allusions, but are told in plain words that the promise to Abraham was that "he should be heir of *the world*;" "the field is *the world*;" "the meek shall inherit *the earth*;" and the promised restitution of "all things" is found to be in the new, or renewed earth. (2 Pet. 3; Rev. 21.) Canaan being the type of the full inheritance, and included in it, could in the time of types and shadows, while the promises were still involved in some obscurity, be most properly spoken of as the inheritance of the fathers.

[2] Gen. 15: 16. [3] Ex. 3: 8, 16, 17.

ise are *Abram* AND *his seed:* "To thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." While in the second promise, the pledge and type of the first, Abram is excluded—"*Unto thy seed* have I given this land"—which agrees with Stephen's testimony, already referred to, that Abram received as an inheritance not enough to set his foot upon.

Another point of difference is even more striking. In ch. 13, Abram is told to "look northward, southward, eastward, and westward." Now the idea lying upon the face of this language is *boundlessness.* It will not do to assert that the words, "all the land that *thou seest*," limit the expression, and confine this promise to the land of Canaan; because such a claim proves too much. If the words, "all thou seest," are to be taken strictly literally, they cannot include all the land of Canaan; because he could not literally see it all. They are evidently used to carry out the idea of the preceding language, boundlessness; area in general, with no specified bounds. And that this is the correct understanding of the language will appear hereafter.

On the other hand, in the covenant of ch. 15, the land is carefully bounded, as between two well-known rivers; and that there may be no mistake, the nations then occupying the territory are mentioned by name.

We also remark that the covenant of ch. 15 is proved to be *conditional;* while that of ch. 13 is strictly *unconditional.* A vital difference.

Having seen the accomplishment of all the other items of Abram's "whereby," we now inquire, Has this, the last and most important of all, been duly fulfilled? We hope not to weary our readers by the abundance of testimony on this subject; for we propose to give ample proof that it is fulfilled, fully and forever, though we cannot within the limits of an article like this transcribe all the evidence we have on this point.

It is not contended that the original covenants, or promises, and the first allusions to them, are in themselves perfectly clear. They are often obscure, and, like other prophecies, purposely so. They are sometimes mingled, as the painter mingles the objects of a landscape in his first outlines upon the canvass: but as his subsequent skillful touches bring out the perspective, and assign each object its relative position, so subsequent revelation assigns

type and antitype, shadow and substance, to their respective ages with a precision that need not be mistaken.[1]

When the time drew near for Joseph to die, he called his brethren together and took an oath of them, as Jacob had previously taken of him, that they would carry up his bones into Canaan, when God should bring them out of Egypt into the land he swear to give to their fathers. After his decease the troubles of the Israelites began to increase; and while their afflictions were multiplying, the iniquity of the Amorites was filling up.[2] At last the time drew nigh for God to fulfill the covenant he had made with their fathers concerning them—the prophetic period of four hundred years was about run out, and the thrilling narrative of the Exodus begins. At the burning bush God reveals to Moses his purpose concerning Israel, thus:

"I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey: unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites."

The allusion to Gen. 15 in this language is too plain to be misunderstood; as it is, also, in the succeeding verses:

"Go, and gather the elders of Israel together, and say unto them, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, appeared unto me saying, I have surely visited you, and seen that which is done to you in Egypt: and I have said, I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt unto the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, unto a land flowing with milk and honey."[3]

After the Exodus, there are continued allusions to its object as being that they might go up to possess the land of Canaan in accordance with the promise or covenant made with Abraham. We quote some passages as samples:

"And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee into the land

[1] Thus we find the land of Canaan sometimes spoken of in the Old Testament as the heritage of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But when the clear light of the Gospel shines, we have no more such allusions, but are told in plain words that the promise to Abraham was that "he should be heir of *the world*;" "the field is *the world*;" "the meek shall inherit *the earth*;" and the promised restitution of "all things" is found to be in the new, or renewed earth. (2 Pet. 3; Rev. 21.) Canaan being the type of the full inheritance, and included in it, could in the time of types and shadows, while the promises were still involved in some obscurity, be most properly spoken of as the inheritance of the fathers.

[2] Gen. 15: 16. [3] Ex. 3: 8, 16, 17.

of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, which he swear unto thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month."[1]

"For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and I will cut them off. Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor serve them, nor do after their works: but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images. And ye shall serve the Lord your God, and he shall bless thy bread, and thy water; and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee....And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee....I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased, and inherit the land. And I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river: for I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand; and thou shalt drive them out before thee. Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their gods. They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me: for if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee."[2]

This latter quotation is more than an intimation of the conditional nature of the covenant under which they were going up to possess Canaan; and in Lev. 26 it is plainly declared, at length, that a course of sin and iniquity would result in scattering them from the land promised for a possession. But we have proof of the conditional nature of this promise in the history of the events following the mission and report of the spies. These returned, all agreed that the land was truly described as full of fatness, and "flowing with milk and honey." But ten out of the twelve were appalled at the power and presence of the Canaanite nations. Their cities were walled up to heaven, and the inhabitants were giants in comparison with whom to the fearful hearts of the spies themselves were but as grasshoppers.[3]

The contagion of fear spread. Except a few, the people forgot that God was able to fulfill that he had promised. All his mighty works in their behalf seemed to have fled from their memory, and in high walls and men of mighty stature they saw insuperable difficulties to him whose tread had made the very mountains tremble and smoke as a furnace in their presence. Faith gone, their hearts melted, and the fiat went forth, that *because of unbelief they should not enter in.*[4]

[1] Ex. 13: 5. [2] Ex. 23: 23–33. [3] Num. 13: 27–33. [4] Heb. 3: 19.

"Surely they shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers....As truly as I live, saith the Lord, as ye have spoken in my ears, so will I do to you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness, and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upward, which have murmured against me, doubtless ye shall not come into the land, concerning which *I swear to make you dwell therein*, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun. But your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, *them will I bring in*, and they shall know the land which ye have despised."[1]

Conclusively the fulfillment of the promise concerning them depended upon the exhibition of the required character on their part. Only two of them lived to "possess the land."

As the forty years of wanderings drew to a close, Moses reminds the people of their record:

"Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that he may perform the word which the Lord swear unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Understand therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people."[2]

"For ye shall pass over Jordan to go in to possess the land which the Lord your God giveth you, and *ye shall possess it*, and dwell therein."[3]

"And Moses called unto Joshua, and said unto him in the sight of all Israel, Be strong and of a good courage; for thou must go with this people unto the land which the Lord hath sworn unto their fathers to give them; and thou shalt *cause them to inherit it.*"[4] [And to the people he said], "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it."[5]

Moses foretold that Joshua should divide the land for an inheritance to Israel, and even "so Joshua took *the whole land*.... and gave it for an inheritance unto Israel according to their di-

[1] Num. 14: 27–31. [2] Deut. 9: 5, 6. [3] Deut. 11: 31. [4] Deut. 31: 6. [5] Deut. 30: 15.

UMI

of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, which he swear unto thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month."[1]

"For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and I will cut them off. Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor serve them, nor do after their works: but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images. And ye shall serve the Lord your God, and he shall bless thy bread, and thy water; and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee....And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee....I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased, and inherit the land. And I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river: for I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand; and thou shalt drive them out before thee. Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their gods. They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me: for if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee."[2]

This latter quotation is more than an intimation of the conditional nature of the covenant under which they were going up to possess Canaan; and in Lev. 26 it is plainly declared, at length, that a course of sin and iniquity would result in scattering them from the land promised for a possession. But we have proof of the conditional nature of this promise in the history of the events following the mission and report of the spies. These returned, all agreed that the land was truly described as full of fatness, and "flowing with milk and honey." But ten out of the twelve were appalled at the power and presence of the Canaanite nations. Their cities were walled up to heaven, and the inhabitants were giants in comparison with whom to the fearful hearts of the spies themselves were but as grasshoppers.[3]

The contagion of fear spread. Except a few, the people forgot that God was able to fulfill that he had promised. All his mighty works in their behalf seemed to have fled from their memory, and in high walls and men of mighty stature they saw insuperable difficulties to him whose tread had made the very mountains tremble and smoke as a furnace in their presence. Faith gone, their hearts melted, and the fiat went forth, that *because of unbelief they should not enter in.*[4]

[1] Ex. 13: 5. [2] Ex. 23: 23–33. [3] Num. 13: 27–33. [4] Heb. 3: 19.

"Surely they shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers....As truly as I live, saith the Lord, as ye have spoken in my ears, so will I do to you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness, and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upward, which have murmured against me, doubtless ye shall not come into the land, concerning which *I swear to make you dwell therein*, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun. But your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, *them will I bring in*, and they shall know the land which ye have despised."[1]

Conclusively the fulfillment of the promise concerning them depended upon the exhibition of the required character on their part. Only two of them lived to "possess the land."

As the forty years of wanderings drew to a close, Moses reminds the people of their record:

"Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that he may perform the word which the Lord swear unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Understand therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people."[2]

"For ye shall pass over Jordan to go in to possess the land which the Lord your God giveth you, and *ye shall possess it*, and dwell therein."[3]

"And Moses called unto Joshua, and said unto him in the sight of all Israel, Be strong and of a good courage; for thou must go with this people unto the land which the Lord hath sworn unto their fathers to give them; and thou shalt *cause them to inherit it.*"[4] [And to the people he said], "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it."[5]

Moses foretold that Joshua should divide the land for an inheritance to Israel, and even "so Joshua took *the whole land*.... and gave it for an inheritance unto Israel according to their di-

[1] Num. 14: 27–31. [2] Deut. 9: 5, 6. [3] Deut. 11: 31. [4] Deut. 31: 6. [5] Deut. 30: 15.

UMI

visions by their tribes."[1] And in the conclusion of Joshua's ministry God says through him to Israel: "And I brought you into the land of the Amorites, which dwelt on the other side Jordan; and they fought with you: and I gave them into your hand, that ye might possess their land; and I destroyed them from before you....And ye went over Jordan, and came unto Jericho: and the men of Jericho fought against you, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Girgashites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: AND I DELIVERED THEM INTO YOUR HAND....*And I* HAVE GIVEN YOU *a land for which ye did not labor.*"[2]

Nor did their great leader fail in his last counsel to remind them of the fulfillment of *all* God had promised them, and the tenure by which they could continue in possession of all:

"And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that *not one thing hath failed of all the good things* which the Lord your God spake concerning you; *all are come to pass unto you*, and not one thing hath failed thereof. Therefore it shall come to pass, that as all good things are come upon you, which the Lord your God promised you; so shall the Lord bring upon you all evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you. When ye have transgressed the covenant of the Lord your God, which he commanded you, and have gone and served other gods, and bowed yourselves to them; then shall the anger of the Lord be kindled against you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which he hath given unto you."[3]

The Psalmist several times alludes to the fulfillment of this covenant.[4] And in the prophets as well as in the historical records we find frequent allusions to the fact that they held their inheritance by promise, and upon conditions. Jeremiah is very plain. In his eleventh chapter God calls upon Israel to remember his covenant and obey him in order that he may be able to perform the oath he swear unto their fathers concerning their land. He then denounces the *curses* of the covenant. And in ch. 32 the prophet says:

"And HAST GIVEN THEM THIS LAND, which thou didst swear to their fathers to give them, a land flowing with milk and honey;

[1] Josh. 11: 23. [2] Josh. 24: 8, 11, 13. [3] Josh. 23: 14-16. [4] 1 Chron. 16: 15-22; Ps. 105: 42-45; 44: 3; 67: 55.

and they came in, AND POSSESSED IT; but they obeyed not thy voice, neither walked in thy law; they have done nothing of all that thou commandedst them to do: therefore thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them."

Daniel, in his memorable prayer just before the close of the captivity, alludes to the same promise, its fulfillment, and its conditions.[1]

But the most direct testimony, and which settles the matter beyond controversy, is that of Nehemiah. He declares "the children went in, and POSSESSED THE LAND, and thou subduedst before them the inhabitants of the land,....and they took strong cities and a fat land,....and were filled....and delighted themselves in thy great goodness." And this in the following language he declares was the fulfillment of the covenant of Gen. 15:

"Thou art the Lord the God, who didst choose Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham; and foundest his heart faithful before thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Jebusites, and the Girgashites, *to give it I say* TO HIS SEED, and *hast* PERFORMED THY WORDS; for thou art righteous."[2]

Having traced the fulfillment of the minor promise to its completion, and ascertained that the natural seed of Abraham, as such, have received all their portion under the Abrahamic covenant, we turn our attention to the greater promise. And while we do this, let us bear in mind as we turn from the Jews' sad story, that as the generation that came out of Egypt "could not enter in because of unbelief;"[3] and as their children failed to retain their inheritance when once gained for the same reason;[4] so we stand by faith,[5] and may fear lest a promise being left us of entering the pre-figured rest, any of us should come short of it. For the word preached is not profitable except it be mixed with faith in us that hear,[6] and the beginning of our confidence be held stedfast unto the end.

We return now to

THE PROMISES OF ETERNAL THINGS.

We inquire first, Who are included by the language addressed to Abraham—"To thee and to thy seed?" Can this "seed" be

[1] ch. 9. [2] ch. 9: 7, 8. [3] Heb. 3: 19. [4] Rom. 11: 20. [5] Heb. 4: 1, 2; 3: 14.

visions by their tribes."[1] And in the conclusion of Joshua's ministry God says through him to Israel: "And I brought you into the land of the Amorites, which dwelt on the other side Jordan; and they fought with you: and I gave them into your hand, that ye might possess their land; and I destroyed them from before you....And ye went over Jordan, and came unto Jericho: and the men of Jericho fought against you, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Girgashites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: AND I DELIVERED THEM INTO YOUR HAND....*And I* HAVE GIVEN YOU *a land for which ye did not labor.*"[2]

Nor did their great leader fail in his last counsel to remind them of the fulfillment of *all* God had promised them, and the tenure by which they could continue in possession of all:

"And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that *not one thing hath failed of all the good things* which the Lord your God spake concerning you; *all are come to pass unto you*, and not one thing hath failed thereof. Therefore it shall come to pass, that as all good things are come upon you, which the Lord your God promised you; so shall the Lord bring upon you all evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you. When ye have transgressed the covenant of the Lord your God, which he commanded you, and have gone and served other gods, and bowed yourselves to them; then shall the anger of the Lord be kindled against you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which he hath given unto you."[3]

The Psalmist several times alludes to the fulfillment of this covenant.[4] And in the prophets as well as in the historical records we find frequent allusions to the fact that they held their inheritance by promise, and upon conditions. Jeremiah is very plain. In his eleventh chapter God calls upon Israel to remember his covenant and obey him in order that he may be able to perform the oath he swear unto their fathers concerning their land. He then denounces the *curses* of the covenant. And in ch. 32 the prophet says:

"And HAST GIVEN THEM THIS LAND, which thou didst swear to their fathers to give them, a land flowing with milk and honey;

[1] Josh. 11: 23. [2] Josh. 24: 8, 11, 13. [3] Josh. 23: 14-16. [4] 1 Chron. 16: 15-22; Ps. 105: 42-45; 44: 3; 67: 55.

and they came in, AND POSSESSED IT; but they obeyed not thy voice, neither walked in thy law; they have done nothing of all that thou commandedst them to do: therefore thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them."

Daniel, in his memorable prayer just before the close of the captivity, alludes to the same promise, its fulfillment, and its conditions.[1]

But the most direct testimony, and which settles the matter beyond controversy, is that of Nehemiah. He declares "the children went in, and POSSESSED THE LAND, and thou subduedst before them the inhabitants of the land,....and they took strong cities and a fat land,....and were filled....and delighted themselves in thy great goodness." And this in the following language he declares was the fulfillment of the covenant of Gen. 15:

"Thou art the Lord the God, who didst choose Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham; and foundest his heart faithful before thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Jebusites, and the Girgashites, *to give it I say* TO HIS SEED, and *hast* PERFORMED THY WORDS; for thou art righteous."[2]

Having traced the fulfillment of the minor promise to its completion, and ascertained that the natural seed of Abraham, as such, have received all their portion under the Abrahamic covenant, we turn our attention to the greater promise. And while we do this, let us bear in mind as we turn from the Jews' sad story, that as the generation that came out of Egypt "could not enter in because of unbelief;"[3] and as their children failed to retain their inheritance when once gained for the same reason;[4] so we stand by faith,[5] and may fear lest a promise being left us of entering the pre-figured rest, any of us should come short of it. For the word preached is not profitable except it be mixed with faith in us that hear,[6] and the beginning of our confidence be held stedfast unto the end.

We return now to

THE PROMISES OF ETERNAL THINGS.

We inquire first, Who are included by the language addressed to Abraham—"To thee and to thy seed?" Can this "seed" be

[1] ch. 9. [2] ch. 9: 7, 8. [3] Heb. 3: 19. [4] Rom. 11: 20. [5] Heb. 4: 1, 2; 3: 14.

he same spoken of as destined to crush the head of our archfoe?[1] Can it be the great "seed" of David, destined to a reign *without end* on the throne of Israel?[2] Let us hear Paul: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made [the promises involving *eternal redemption*]. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, *And to thy seed*, WHICH IS CHRIST."[3] This is the key to open the Abrahamic gospel. The bars of obscurity in prediction are turned aside by the key of inspired interpretation. Let us not interpret interpretations, but receive them.

We find, then, that the parties to this covenant are Abraham and Christ. Abraham is included as the chosen progenitor of the typical people, of whom is salvation: for from them sprung the Messiah, and of whom we read:

"I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."[4]

If this were all in this connection, it might be urged that the Jews had broken the covenant, and brought the whole scheme to naught. But Paul only introduces this language in order to meet this very objection. He wishes to show that however their backsliding might affect them and their relations to the promises, it could by no means destroy the promises of God in Christ. And why? Because it is "not as though the word of God had taken none effect. *For they are not all Israel which are of Israel:* neither because they are *the seed of Abraham* are they *all children:* but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are *the children of the flesh* THESE ARE NOT THE CHILDREN OF GOD: but the CHILDREN OF THE PROMISE are counted for the seed."[5]

Can any explanation make these words clearer? Paul has been talking of the promised resurrection, restitution, and glorification. The natural seed, or children of the flesh, are *not all* children, or heirs of God, joint-heirs with Christ, to the promises,

[1] Gen. 3: 15. [2] Luke 1: 33. [3] Gal. 3: 16. [4] Rom. 9: 1-5. [5] Rom. 9: 6-8.

but they belong to a class called "the children of the promise." Who are they? Let Paul answer: "Now we, BRETHREN, as Isaac was, are the children of promise."[1] Not "born after the flesh," but children by faith.

"But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.[2] . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."[3]

Let the Abrahamic promise include what it may, the foregoing language shuts us up to the faith that sex, condition, or nationality have no weight whatever in determining who shall be partakers in it: character is the sole test of participation. And thus Paul silences and puts to shame those who had distracted the church with claims of Jewish superiority.

"Heirs according to the promise." Turning to the record of the promise, we find among the chiefest of its provisions these words: "In thee shall all nations be blessed." Does scripture interpret this language also, so as to leave us in no doubt of its meaning? It does. In the third chapter of Acts we read:

"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days.

"Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

In the gift of gifts, the blessing of blessings, God's own Son with power on earth to forgive sins, we find the peculiar blessing of the Abrahamic covenant: for whatever is included in the promise of eternal redemption, all is obtained through him, by the forgiveness of our sins and in turning away from our iniquities. Let none take from Christ this glory, and give it, as some unfortunately have done, to one or more of the items of our in-

[1] Gal. 4: 28. [2] Comp. Rom. 11: 32. [3] Gal. 3: 22, 26, 29.

UMI

he same spoken of as destined to crush the head of our archfoe?[1] Can it be the great "seed" of David, destined to a reign *without end* on the throne of Israel?[2] Let us hear Paul: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made [the promises involving *eternal redemption*]. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, *And to thy seed*, WHICH IS CHRIST."[3] This is the key to open the Abrahamic gospel. The bars of obscurity in prediction are turned aside by the key of inspired interpretation. Let us not interpret interpretations, but receive them.

We find, then, that the parties to this covenant are Abraham and Christ. Abraham is included as the chosen progenitor of the typical people, of whom is salvation: for from them sprung the Messiah, and of whom we read:

"I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."[4]

If this were all in this connection, it might be urged that the Jews had broken the covenant, and brought the whole scheme to naught. But Paul only introduces this language in order to meet this very objection. He wishes to show that however their backsliding might affect them and their relations to the promises, it could by no means destroy the promises of God in Christ. And why? Because it is "not as though the word of God had taken none effect. *For they are not all Israel which are of Israel:* neither because they are *the seed of Abraham* are they *all children:* but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are *the children of the flesh* THESE ARE NOT THE CHILDREN OF GOD: but the CHILDREN OF THE PROMISE are counted for the seed."[5]

Can any explanation make these words clearer? Paul has been talking of the promised resurrection, restitution, and glorification. The natural seed, or children of the flesh, are *not all* children, or heirs of God, joint-heirs with Christ, to the promises,

[1] Gen. 3: 15. [2] Luke 1: 33. [3] Gal. 3: 16. [4] Rom. 9: 1-5. [5] Rom. 9: 6-8.

but they belong to a class called "the children of the promise." Who are they? Let Paul answer: "Now we, BRETHREN, as Isaac was, are the children of promise."[1] Not "born after the flesh," but children by faith.

"But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.[2] . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."[3]

Let the Abrahamic promise include what it may, the foregoing language shuts us up to the faith that sex, condition, or nationality have no weight whatever in determining who shall be partakers in it: character is the sole test of participation. And thus Paul silences and puts to shame those who had distracted the church with claims of Jewish superiority.

"Heirs according to the promise." Turning to the record of the promise, we find among the chiefest of its provisions these words: "In thee shall all nations be blessed." Does scripture interpret this language also, so as to leave us in no doubt of its meaning? It does. In the third chapter of Acts we read:

"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days.

"Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

In the gift of gifts, the blessing of blessings, God's own Son with power on earth to forgive sins, we find the peculiar blessing of the Abrahamic covenant: for whatever is included in the promise of eternal redemption, all is obtained through him, by the forgiveness of our sins and in turning away from our iniquities. Let none take from Christ this glory, and give it, as some unfortunately have done, to one or more of the items of our in-

[1] Gal. 4: 28. [2] Comp. Rom. 11: 32. [3] Gal. 3: 22, 26, 29.

UMI

heritance; for we have Peter's word for it, that the promise to make Abraham a blessing to all families of earth was fulfilled in sending Jesus with full power to turn all who would be turned from their iniquities.

It is a popular theory that the promise of blessing to all nations means their conversion, *en masse*, some placing the event before, and some after the Second Advent. The advocates of both these theories rely upon much the same passages to sustain their view. On examination it will be found that in most cases the context of these very passages overthrows the theory they are pressed to sustain. For instance: Ps. 2: 8 is most popular at missionary meetings. The next verse however is omitted. Let us put them together:

THE VERSE QUOTED.	THE VERSE OMITTED.
"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."	"Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

The reason for the omission is too apparent to call for italics even. The neglected passage suggests the dread symbolism of the last verses of the nineteenth of Revelation, rather than the scenes of the fabled Millennium.

Paul makes a definite application of this promise. He says "it is of faith, that it might be of grace; to the end that it might be sure to ALL the seed: not to that only which is of the law [God's saints under that dispensation]; but to that also which is *of the faith* of Abraham, who is *the father of us all*, as it is written: I have made thee a father of many nations." And that there may be no mistake, he also declares: "When ye read ye may understand my knowledge of the mystery of Christ[1] .... now revealed, ... that the Gentiles should be FELLOW-HEIRS, AND OF THE SAME BODY, AND PARTAKERS of his promise in Christ by the gospel." And another apostle asserts that this visitation of the Gentiles is "to TAKE OUT OF THEM a people for his name."[2]

Having found the Redeemer and the redeemed, let us now look for "the land" of this Abrahamic gospel. Once more we turn to Paul. He says that "the promise that he should be heir

[1] *Mystery* here means a truth which had previously been hidden, or purposely kept in obscurity: not something difficult of comprehension—though indeed many seem to find it so.
[2] Acts 15: 14.

of the world [the *kosmos*, or physical globe] was not to Abraham or his seed through the law; but through the righteousness of faith." In Ephesians he presents the Spirit as the earnest of our inheritance until *the redemption* of the *purchased* possession." In the thirteenth of Matthew we have the purchase recorded. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and *buyeth that field*."[1] "The field is the world," said Jesus;[2] the same Jesus who, although he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor; and for us left the glory he had with the Father before the world was, that out of the world he might redeem his Bride. Most of her members are now hidden in the field; but it is a *purchased* field; and ere long will be redeemed, and then "the hidden treasure" will be manifested.

The Psalmist foresaw the extent of the inheritance. Seven times in one Psalm[3] he reiterates that the earth shall be the abode of the saints. "Such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be cut off." And the epoch of their entrance into their possession is also clearly fixed by him: "Wait on the Lord and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land [earth]: *when the wicked are cut off* [their punishment, indicated in the preceding verse; not their *conversion*], thou shalt see it"—the promised land. This is all plainly literal language, easily understood. Need we quote Isaiah's testimony concerning the new earth, or Daniel's prediction of a kingdom under the whole heavens, or Christ's renewal of the promise to the meek, or Paul's heavenly country with its capital built by God, or Peter's expression of the Church's hope of a new heaven and earth, or the Revelator's ecstatic vision of the same? Our hearts glow with even this reference to the views they give of our eternal home; but our allotted space is already full; and a few words concerning

THE CONSUMMATION

of the gospel preached to Abraham must suffice. The Revelator in his fifth chapter relates a vision which brings to our view the innumerable company, like the sand by the sea-shore, gathered *out of* all nations. Of them it is said:

[1] The absurdity of the too common application of this parable is apparent on a little thought. Do men *purchase* salvation? or is it a free gift, bought without money or price? In the parable is a *bona fide* purchase.
[2] V. 38. [3] The 37th.

heritance; for we have Peter's word for it, that the promise to make Abraham a blessing to all families of earth was fulfilled in sending Jesus with full power to turn all who would be turned from their iniquities.

It is a popular theory that the promise of blessing to all nations means their conversion, *en masse*, some placing the event before, and some after the Second Advent. The advocates of both these theories rely upon much the same passages to sustain their view. On examination it will be found that in most cases the context of these very passages overthrows the theory they are pressed to sustain. For instance: Ps. 2: 8 is most popular at missionary meetings. The next verse however is omitted. Let us put them together:

THE VERSE QUOTED.	THE VERSE OMITTED.
"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."	"Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

The reason for the omission is too apparent to call for italics even. The neglected passage suggests the dread symbolism of the last verses of the nineteenth of Revelation, rather than the scenes of the fabled Millennium.

Paul makes a definite application of this promise. He says "it is of faith, that it might be of grace; to the end that it might be sure to ALL the seed: not to that only which is of the law [God's saints under that dispensation]; but to that also which is *of the faith* of Abraham, who is *the father of us all*, as it is written: I have made thee a father of many nations." And that there may be no mistake, he also declares: "When ye read ye may understand my knowledge of the mystery of Christ[1] .... now revealed, ... that the Gentiles should be FELLOW-HEIRS, AND OF THE SAME BODY, AND PARTAKERS of his promise in Christ by the gospel." And another apostle asserts that this visitation of the Gentiles is "to TAKE OUT OF THEM a people for his name."[2]

Having found the Redeemer and the redeemed, let us now look for "the land" of this Abrahamic gospel. Once more we turn to Paul. He says that "the promise that he should be heir

[1] *Mystery* here means a truth which had previously been hidden, or purposely kept in obscurity: not something difficult of comprehension—though indeed many seem to find it so.
[2] Acts 15: 14.

of the world [the *kosmos*, or physical globe] was not to Abraham or his seed through the law; but through the righteousness of faith." In Ephesians he presents the Spirit as the earnest of our inheritance until *the redemption* of the *purchased* possession." In the thirteenth of Matthew we have the purchase recorded. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and *buyeth that field*."[1] "The field is the world," said Jesus;[2] the same Jesus who, although he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor; and for us left the glory he had with the Father before the world was, that out of the world he might redeem his Bride. Most of her members are now hidden in the field; but it is a *purchased* field; and ere long will be redeemed, and then "the hidden treasure" will be manifested.

The Psalmist foresaw the extent of the inheritance. Seven times in one Psalm[3] he reiterates that the earth shall be the abode of the saints. "Such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be cut off." And the epoch of their entrance into their possession is also clearly fixed by him: "Wait on the Lord and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land [earth]: *when the wicked are cut off* [their punishment, indicated in the preceding verse; not their *conversion*], thou shalt see it"—the promised land. This is all plainly literal language, easily understood. Need we quote Isaiah's testimony concerning the new earth, or Daniel's prediction of a kingdom under the whole heavens, or Christ's renewal of the promise to the meek, or Paul's heavenly country with its capital built by God, or Peter's expression of the Church's hope of a new heaven and earth, or the Revelator's ecstatic vision of the same? Our hearts glow with even this reference to the views they give of our eternal home; but our allotted space is already full; and a few words concerning

THE CONSUMMATION

of the gospel preached to Abraham must suffice. The Revelator in his fifth chapter relates a vision which brings to our view the innumerable company, like the sand by the sea-shore, gathered *out of* all nations. Of them it is said:

[1] The absurdity of the too common application of this parable is apparent on a little thought. Do men *purchase* salvation? or is it a free gift, bought without money or price? In the parable is a *bona fide* purchase.
[2] V. 38. [3] The 37th.

"And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and WE SHALL REIGN ON THE EARTH."[1]

With such positive testimony as this before them, how did the Church ever learn to sing that absurdity—

"Beyond the bounds of time and space [!]
Look forward to a heavenly place,
The saints' secure abode."

The refrain of the saints answers back, No: "*we* shall live and reign *on the earth*."

Again, John carried away in vision beheld the redeemed in the enjoyment of the fruition of the promises, made unto the fathers. The adversary's head is crushed; his works destroyed; the last traces of sin swept from the universe; the hopes of bereaved ones justified in reunion with their loved and lost ones; tears dried; faith lost in sight; hope fully realized; the last enemy destroyed.

"After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.

"And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshiped God, saying, Amen: blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God forever and ever. Amen.

"And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?

"And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest.

"And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

[1] Rev. 5: 9, 10.

THE BLISSFUL VISION.

I sat me down to muse one weary day,
And soon in thought was wandering far away.
Before me rose a shining, narrow gate;
It swung, and lo! a saintly form did wait
Within for me. Amazed I saw him stand
And stretch his own to grasp my mortal hand.
"Come unto me," he said, "earth-weary child,
And I will teach thee;" and so sweetly smiled
That all my fears were fled, and by his side
I held his hand—my more than mortal guide.
And he was speaking as he led me forth:
And first he told me, "This is God's new earth;"
And I had guessed it, though my searching eyes
Had swept but once the landscape and the skies.
For at my feet the soil seemed new and clean,
And all the grass grew thickly fresh and green,
Which all among were flowers of every hue,
And bursting buds just pushing into view.
And trees, and vines, and all I saw below
Seemed beautiful as God could make them grow.
And I was thinking of a sacred verse
When he who led me, spake it; "*No more curse*—"
And I was listening as we passed along
To catch the floating snatches of a song,
Till coming nearer, thus I caught the strain,
"Worthy the Lamb for us that once was slain."
I gazed entranced, for mighty hosts were singing,
And golden harps with richest tones were ringing,
As now the glad refrain came pouring forth:
"*For us*, and we shall reign upon the earth!"
What beams of glory danced on every brow,
And every cheek wore health and beauty now.
"And is disease a stranger here?" I asked, full fain.
My guide responding answered, "*No more pain.*"
He brought me and we wandered long beside
A flowing river, deep, and clear, and wide,
Till high on either bank, a branching wood,
Kissing the sky in awful grandeur, stood
With monthly fruitage full. "Life's trees," he saith,
And then kept on repeating, "*No more death.*"
My eyes were chained intent, till when my guide
Bade me look farther back, on either side,
And lo! a city—but with mortal tongue,
I stop and leave its glories all unsung.
And now such radiant light around was shining
Methought ourselves beyond the day's declining;
For wave on wave the city flashed afar,
Its dazzling splendor like a burning star.
And he who led me, read my thoughts aright,
And spake them shortly, saying, "*No more night.*"
What! "*No more curse, nor pain, nor death, nor night?*"
Bright vision of a world, surpassing bright!
"And can it be that things will always stay
As beautiful, and glorious, as they seem to-day?"
I said, as coming to the shining gate
My guide still holding me, content to wait;
"Always," he said, "the nature of this clime
Is one bright, balmy, constant summer-time."—*J. Albert Libby.*

"And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and WE SHALL REIGN ON THE EARTH."[1]

With such positive testimony as this before them, how did the Church ever learn to sing that absurdity—

"Beyond the bounds of time and space [!]
Look forward to a heavenly place,
The saints' secure abode."

The refrain of the saints answers back, No: "*we* shall live and reign *on the earth*."

Again, John carried away in vision beheld the redeemed in the enjoyment of the fruition of the promises, made unto the fathers. The adversary's head is crushed; his works destroyed; the last traces of sin swept from the universe; the hopes of bereaved ones justified in reunion with their loved and lost ones; tears dried; faith lost in sight; hope fully realized; the last enemy destroyed.

"After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.

"And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshiped God, saying, Amen: blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God forever and ever. Amen.

"And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?

"And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest.

"And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

[1] Rev. 5: 9, 10.

THE BLISSFUL VISION.

I sat me down to muse one weary day,
And soon in thought was wandering far away.
Before me rose a shining, narrow gate;
It swung, and lo! a saintly form did wait
Within for me. Amazed I saw him stand
And stretch his own to grasp my mortal hand.
"Come unto me," he said, "earth-weary child,
And I will teach thee;" and so sweetly smiled
That all my fears were fled, and by his side
I held his hand—my more than mortal guide.
And he was speaking as he led me forth:
And first he told me, "This is God's new earth;"
And I had guessed it, though my searching eyes
Had swept but once the landscape and the skies.
For at my feet the soil seemed new and clean,
And all the grass grew thickly fresh and green,
Which all among were flowers of every hue,
And bursting buds just pushing into view.
And trees, and vines, and all I saw below
Seemed beautiful as God could make them grow.
And I was thinking of a sacred verse
When he who led me, spake it; "*No more curse*—"
And I was listening as we passed along
To catch the floating snatches of a song,
Till coming nearer, thus I caught the strain,
"Worthy the Lamb for us that once was slain."
I gazed entranced, for mighty hosts were singing,
And golden harps with richest tones were ringing,
As now the glad refrain came pouring forth:
"*For us*, and we shall reign upon the earth!"
What beams of glory danced on every brow,
And every cheek wore health and beauty now.
"And is disease a stranger here?" I asked, full fain.
My guide responding answered, "*No more pain.*"
He brought me and we wandered long beside
A flowing river, deep, and clear, and wide,
Till high on either bank, a branching wood,
Kissing the sky in awful grandeur, stood
With monthly fruitage full. "Life's trees," he saith,
And then kept on repeating, "*No more death.*"
My eyes were chained intent, till when my guide
Bade me look farther back, on either side,
And lo! a city—but with mortal tongue,
I stop and leave its glories all unsung.
And now such radiant light around was shining
Methought ourselves beyond the day's declining;
For wave on wave the city flashed afar,
Its dazzling splendor like a burning star.
And he who led me, read my thoughts aright,
And spake them shortly, saying, "*No more night.*"
What! "*No more curse, nor pain, nor death, nor night?*"
Bright vision of a world, surpassing bright!
"And can it be that things will always stay
As beautiful, and glorious, as they seem to-day?"
I said, as coming to the shining gate
My guide still holding me, content to wait;
"Always," he said, "the nature of this clime
Is one bright, balmy, constant summer-time."—*J. Albert Libby.*

THE DURATION AND NATURE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Constable, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland.

Future punishment for the sins of the present life is universally allowed to be taught in Scripture; but, with respect to its nature and its duration, very opposite opinions have been and are maintained as being each of them the doctrine of God's Word. We speak only of punishment to be inflicted subsequent to the judgment. With the condition of the soul in its separate state in *hades* we have here nothing to do.

There are three main opinions relative to this punishment. One of these makes it to be essentially of a purgative nature, to be temporary in its duration, and to have as its issue the restoration of all to God's favor and eternal happiness. This was the opinion of Origen. The second is that which has heretofore been most commonly received. It makes punishment to be eternal in its duration, and supposes that, throughout this eternity, the damned continue to live in a state of pain. This was the theory of Augustine. According to the third opinion, punishment is eternal; but *death; i. e.*, the cessation of life, is its very essence, attended and preceded by such various degrees of pain as a just and merciful God, for wise reasons, sees fit to inflict. The third of these opinions is the one here maintained. Its establishment will of course set aside the others. Its eternal duration will overthrow that of Origen: its character, involving a state of death, will overthrow both Origen's view and also the theory of everlasting pain. We rest its proof on repeated declarations of Scripture, and on arguments drawn from the character of God.

With respect to the eternity of future punishment, we will be brief. To us it has always appeared that, as clearly as Scripture teaches that there will be punishment, with the same clearness it teaches that it will be eternal—without end. We will give the chief grounds on which we rest our opinion.

In the first place, its duration is described in the very same terms as the happiness of the redeemed: "These," saith Christ, speaking of the reprobate, "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."[1] Here the same Greek word[2] is used for the duration of these opposite states. If, as all allow, it means eternal in the case of the righteous, it surely must mean so in that of the wicked. How absurd would such a translation as this be—"These shall go away into punishment which is not eternal; but the righteous into life which is eternal!"

Again: our Lord has repeatedly declared, that there are persons who, at no time and under no change of dispensation, shall have forgiveness: "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."[3] This appears wholly inconsistent with the idea that such persons should, after a certain amount of punishment, enter into the peace of God.

What Christ has here said of one class of sinners, he has said elsewhere in (if possible) stronger language of all who reject him: "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."[4] If, after a certain purgation, such men passed from a state of punishment into one of happiness, these words of Christ—we say it with all reverence—would not and could not be true; for such men would see life, on such men the wrath of God would not abide.

Again: there are persons of whom our Lord affirms that it would have been better for them if they had not been born.[5] Such an affirmation is incompatible with the idea that they should after a punishment of any conceivable length, enter upon a life of bliss. The first moment of release would make amends for all past suffering; throughout eternity they would praise God that they had been born.

Once more: the following argument, proving a state of death to be the condition to which the reprobate are finally reduced, is fatal to the idea of their restoration to favor. We might fancy a life of misery exchanged for one of peace, but to the dead there could come no change at all. They would first need another recreation, of which certainly no word of Scripture gives us any hint.

For these, and other reasons, we are persuaded that punishment will be of an eternal duration. The judgment once passed, God holds out no hope beyond. Man now makes his choice of

[1] Matt. 25: 46. [2] Aionios. [3] Matt. 12: 31; Luke 12: 10. [4] John 3: 36. [5] Matt. 26: 24; Mark 14: 21.

THE DURATION AND NATURE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Constable, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland.

Future punishment for the sins of the present life is universally allowed to be taught in Scripture; but, with respect to its nature and its duration, very opposite opinions have been and are maintained as being each of them the doctrine of God's Word. We speak only of punishment to be inflicted subsequent to the judgment. With the condition of the soul in its separate state in *hades* we have here nothing to do.

There are three main opinions relative to this punishment. One of these makes it to be essentially of a purgative nature, to be temporary in its duration, and to have as its issue the restoration of all to God's favor and eternal happiness. This was the opinion of Origen. The second is that which has heretofore been most commonly received. It makes punishment to be eternal in its duration, and supposes that, throughout this eternity, the damned continue to live in a state of pain. This was the theory of Augustine. According to the third opinion, punishment is eternal; but *death; i. e.*, the cessation of life, is its very essence, attended and preceded by such various degrees of pain as a just and merciful God, for wise reasons, sees fit to inflict. The third of these opinions is the one here maintained. Its establishment will of course set aside the others. Its eternal duration will overthrow that of Origen: its character, involving a state of death, will overthrow both Origen's view and also the theory of everlasting pain. We rest its proof on repeated declarations of Scripture, and on arguments drawn from the character of God.

With respect to the eternity of future punishment, we will be brief. To us it has always appeared that, as clearly as Scripture teaches that there will be punishment, with the same clearness it teaches that it will be eternal—without end. We will give the chief grounds on which we rest our opinion.

In the first place, its duration is described in the very same terms as the happiness of the redeemed: "These," saith Christ, speaking of the reprobate, "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."[1] Here the same Greek word[2] is used for the duration of these opposite states. If, as all allow, it means eternal in the case of the righteous, it surely must mean so in that of the wicked. How absurd would such a translation as this be—"These shall go away into punishment which is not eternal; but the righteous into life which is eternal!"

Again: our Lord has repeatedly declared, that there are persons who, at no time and under no change of dispensation, shall have forgiveness: "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."[3] This appears wholly inconsistent with the idea that such persons should, after a certain amount of punishment, enter into the peace of God.

What Christ has here said of one class of sinners, he has said elsewhere in (if possible) stronger language of all who reject him: "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."[4] If, after a certain purgation, such men passed from a state of punishment into one of happiness, these words of Christ—we say it with all reverence—would not and could not be true; for such men would see life, on such men the wrath of God would not abide.

Again: there are persons of whom our Lord affirms that it would have been better for them if they had not been born.[5] Such an affirmation is incompatible with the idea that they should after a punishment of any conceivable length, enter upon a life of bliss. The first moment of release would make amends for all past suffering; throughout eternity they would praise God that they had been born.

Once more: the following argument, proving a state of death to be the condition to which the reprobate are finally reduced, is fatal to the idea of their restoration to favor. We might fancy a life of misery exchanged for one of peace, but to the dead there could come no change at all. They would first need another recreation, of which certainly no word of Scripture gives us any hint.

For these, and other reasons, we are persuaded that punishment will be of an eternal duration. The judgment once passed, God holds out no hope beyond. Man now makes his choice of

[1] Matt. 25: 46. [2] Aionios. [3] Matt. 12: 31; Luke 12: 10. [4] John 3: 36. [5] Matt. 26: 24; Mark 14: 21.

one or other condition hereafter, each of which will be alike eternal.

In what will this eternal state consist? That is now our question. We hold that it does not consist in any eternal life spent in pain of body, or remorse of mind, but that a state of utter death and destruction, is that state which abides forever. The length of time which this process of dissolution takes, and the degrees of bodily or mental pain which precede and accompany it, are questions which we must leave to that providence of God which rules in hell as in heaven. One thing only we can with certainty gather. It is, that the process of dissolution will afford scope for that great variety of punishment, which the reprobate will suffer hereafter, from that which in its justice is terrible to that which, with equal justice, is scarcely felt at all.

We need not stop to argue that, between this view of punishment and that which maintains an eternal existence in pain, there is no comparison. The present life shows us this. When hope has ceased to cheer its future, men willingly lay it aside for death; when pain has made it a weary burden, the friends of the sufferer thank God for its termination. So the close of each agonized life in hell would be longed for there; would send a thrill of relief through the inhabitants of heaven.

It may be well to say a few words on the probable reasons which have from a very ancient period led a majority of Christians to hold the doctrine of an eternal life of pain, as it will be requisite to show that one of these reasons is without foundation before we proceed to the establishment of our own view.

Before the preaching of the Gospel, the highest order of heathen intellect had framed for its satisfaction a theory of the immortality of the soul. While the generality of heathen philosophers taught that death was for all an eternal sleep,[1] there were 'high spirits of old' that strained their eyes to see, beyond the clouds of time, the dawning of immortality. Unable, as we are able, to connect it with God as its source, and with his promise as our assurance, they framed the idea of an immortality, self-existing in the soul itself. Plato, in his *Phædo*, has given us the marvelous reasoning of Socrates, and Cicero has exhibited the argument in his *Tusculan Questions*. According to it, the soul is possessed of an inherent immortality. It is of necessity eternal. It could have no end: no death. What was true of one soul, was true of all souls alike, whether good or bad. They must exist somewhere, be it in Tartarus, or Cocytus, in Pyriphlegethon, or the happy abodes of the purified. This sublime philosophical idea passed readily and early into the theology of the Christian Church. We find it running throughout the reasoning of Tertullian and Augustine.[2] Heedless of Paul's warning voice against philosophy, they became the feeble apes of Plato. They applied their theology, as he his philosophy, to all souls alike—to those of the rebrobate as of the redeemed. They taught that the life of the former *must be* as eternal as that of the latter.

To this view the declarations of Scripture relative to future punishment were attached, and by it these declarations were moulded.[3] The eternity of this punishment, and the many passages which speak of life and pain as existing, at least in some classes of the damned, in hell, were joined to the heathen doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and hence was formed the plausible and generally accepted view, that not only was future punishment eternal, but that it also consisted in eternal life spent in eternal pain. The fears of mankind, and the laudable desire, on the part of Christian teachers, to warn by the most terrible of all denunciations, filled in this awful description of the future of the lost. The utter callousness to suffering, produced by the long reign of heathen cruelty, and shared to some extent even by the Christian mind of the period, bore it without a shudder, if not with positive satisfaction.[4]

The foundation of this theory was a mere fancy: that which gave continuity to its parts was but a rope of sand. The essential immortality of the soul was, as Pliny called it, a figment. Its inherent fallacy will be to us apparent from the fact, that it involved of necessity *a past eternity of the soul* as much as a future. Cicero gives it expression where he says of the soul, "it can neither be born nor can it die."[5] Some of the Fathers, shunning the first part of the proposition, eagerly adopted the second. They were just as wrong as, only less consistent than, the heathen thinkers. Others, judging more truly, rejected all idea of any essential immortality of the soul.[6] Scripture denies the entire proposition: its second part as much as its first. . . . To our

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, p. 91. Ed. Paris, 1615.

[1] Tertullian, *De Anima*, Paris, 1675; Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, 21: 3, Antwerp, 1700.
[2] Tertullian, ap. 22, p. 23.
[3] *Eternity of Future Punishment*. G. Salmon, D. D., 2nd ed., p. 19.
[4] Tusc. Disp. 1: 23.
[5] Justin Martyr, pp. 206-7, 208; Irenæus, *Cont. Hær.* 2, 34, p. 128, ed. Paris, 1675.

UMI

one or other condition hereafter, each of which will be alike eternal.

In what will this eternal state consist? That is now our question. We hold that it does not consist in any eternal life spent in pain of body, or remorse of mind, but that a state of utter death and destruction, is that state which abides forever. The length of time which this process of dissolution takes, and the degrees of bodily or mental pain which precede and accompany it, are questions which we must leave to that providence of God which rules in hell as in heaven. One thing only we can with certainty gather. It is, that the process of dissolution will afford scope for that great variety of punishment, which the reprobate will suffer hereafter, from that which in its justice is terrible to that which, with equal justice, is scarcely felt at all.

We need not stop to argue that, between this view of punishment and that which maintains an eternal existence in pain, there is no comparison. The present life shows us this. When hope has ceased to cheer its future, men willingly lay it aside for death; when pain has made it a weary burden, the friends of the sufferer thank God for its termination. So the close of each agonized life in hell would be longed for there; would send a thrill of relief through the inhabitants of heaven.

It may be well to say a few words on the probable reasons which have from a very ancient period led a majority of Christians to hold the doctrine of an eternal life of pain, as it will be requisite to show that one of these reasons is without foundation before we proceed to the establishment of our own view.

Before the preaching of the Gospel, the highest order of heathen intellect had framed for its satisfaction a theory of the immortality of the soul. While the generality of heathen philosophers taught that death was for all an eternal sleep,[1] there were 'high spirits of old' that strained their eyes to see, beyond the clouds of time, the dawning of immortality. Unable, as we are able, to connect it with God as its source, and with his promise as our assurance, they framed the idea of an immortality, self-existing in the soul itself. Plato, in his *Phædo*, has given us the marvelous reasoning of Socrates, and Cicero has exhibited the argument in his *Tusculan Questions*. According to it, the soul is possessed of an inherent immortality. It is of necessity eternal. It could have no end: no death. What was true of one soul, was true of all souls alike, whether good or bad. They must exist somewhere, be it in Tartarus, or Cocytus, in Pyriphlegethon, or the happy abodes of the purified. This sublime philosophical idea passed readily and early into the theology of the Christian Church. We find it running throughout the reasoning of Tertullian and Augustine.[2] Heedless of Paul's warning voice against philosophy, they became the feeble apes of Plato. They applied their theology, as he his philosophy, to all souls alike—to those of the rebrobate as of the redeemed. They taught that the life of the former *must be* as eternal as that of the latter.

To this view the declarations of Scripture relative to future punishment were attached, and by it these declarations were moulded.[3] The eternity of this punishment, and the many passages which speak of life and pain as existing, at least in some classes of the damned, in hell, were joined to the heathen doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and hence was formed the plausible and generally accepted view, that not only was future punishment eternal, but that it also consisted in eternal life spent in eternal pain. The fears of mankind, and the laudable desire, on the part of Christian teachers, to warn by the most terrible of all denunciations, filled in this awful description of the future of the lost. The utter callousness to suffering, produced by the long reign of heathen cruelty, and shared to some extent even by the Christian mind of the period, bore it without a shudder, if not with positive satisfaction.[4]

The foundation of this theory was a mere fancy: that which gave continuity to its parts was but a rope of sand. The essential immortality of the soul was, as Pliny called it, a figment. Its inherent fallacy will be to us apparent from the fact, that it involved of necessity *a past eternity of the soul* as much as a future. Cicero gives it expression where he says of the soul, "it can neither be born nor can it die."[5] Some of the Fathers, shunning the first part of the proposition, eagerly adopted the second. They were just as wrong as, only less consistent than, the heathen thinkers. Others, judging more truly, rejected all idea of any essential immortality of the soul.[6] Scripture denies the entire proposition: its second part as much as its first. . . . To our

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, p. 91. Ed. Paris, 1615.

[1] Tertullian, *De Anima*, Paris, 1675; Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, 21: 3, Antwerp, 1700.
[2] Tertullian, ap. 22, p. 23.
[3] *Eternity of Future Punishment*. G. Salmon, D. D., 2nd ed., p. 19.
[4] Tusc. Disp. 1: 23.
[5] Justin Martyr, pp. 206-7, 208; Irenæus, *Cont. Hær.* 2, 34, p. 128, ed. Paris, 1675.

UMI

aspirations for eternity it answers by the promise of eternal life through Christ Jesus. But there it stops. An essential immortality of the soul it denies as explicitly as it denies it to the body. To one being only—to God—does it allow to have life in himself: of one being only—God—does it allow immortality; *i. e.*, the absolute incapacity of death[1] to be an attribute.[2] And here, as in everything else, Scripture is the book of the highest reason. That which has had a beginning may have an end. That on which God has bestowed life he may and can inflict death. The highest intelligences as much as the lowest must depend on him for the continuance of their life. Let him withdraw his sustaining power and the mighty Archangel becomes a thing of nought as completely as the insect which dances in the sunbeams for an hour and then passes away forever.

Having removed all obstacles arising from an erroneous notion of the nature of the soul, we proceed to consider the direct proofs of our view. We will first advert to the testimony of the Old Testament. This indeed is by no means so clear, either as to the future of the redeemed or the lost, as the New Testament, but there are undoubtedly many places in it which speak of both.

We will first advert to the original conception of death. It was very early spoken of by God himself. "In the day that thou eatest" of the tree of knowledge, he said to Adam, "thou shalt surely die."[3] God explains his word to man—"dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."[4] God's definition of the death inflicted for the first transgression is frequently repeated in different words in the later Scriptures. Thus Paul tells us that it is the death which all men undergo, whether they are among the saved or the lost.[5] Such too was that death which Christ endured for human sin—the same death which the thieves beside him suffered, "even the death of the cross."[6] We have thus the original meaning of death clearly and explicitly displayed in Scripture. It did not mean life spent in pain, but the loss of the life which God first gave to man in Eden. Such was man's primitive idea of death. Such was the universal idea formed of it wherever men lived and died. In their own case and in that of the lower creatures, they saw it exemplified every day. The idea first presented by God was perpetuated by universal experience.

Language, we know, assumes a variety of meaning. Words

[1] *Athanasia.* [2] John 5: 26; 1 Tim. 6: 16. [3] Gen. 2: 17. [4] Gen. 3: 19. [5] Rom. 5: 12, 14, 17; 1 Cor. 15: 22. [6] Phil. 2: 8; Acts 5: 30; Rom. 6: 7, 8.

sometimes undergo so many subtle changes of sense, that their latter meaning becomes the direct opposite to their first. The word death has, however, remained true to its original import in its various applications. Thus, we have in Scripture the state of spiritual death, or the being "dead in trespasses and sins:" we have the expressions "dead to sin," "dead to the law:" in our catechism we have the phrase 'a death unto sin:' in ordinary life we speak of persons as being dead to certain passions. All such expressions are derived from material death, and are true to its original sense. They imply the departure of relations and feelings which once were living and strong—*their death.* To the universal sense imposed on death in all times and by all nations, there is but one exception, that given to it in the theology of a porton of Christendom. In that theology, and in that alone, death is made to mean its direct opposite—*life.*

But this late meaning attached by many Christians to the term death in one of its applications, namely: to future punishment, has not the smallest force as regards its use in the Old Testament. There the word must be taken in the sense stamped upon it and unaltered. There it is over and over again described as the end in the future world of obstinate transgressors. For such, God declares he has "provided the *instruments of death*:" of such as hate divine wisdom that Wisdom says "they that hate me *love death*:" to the wicked God saith "thou shalt surely die:" "the soul that sinneth it shall die."[1]

No one, we suppose, will apply such expressions to that death which all alike undergo as the children of Adam. They can only apply to future punishment. Death, then, according to the Old Testament, is to be after judgment the result of sin, as life is the result of righteousness. Can we suppose a God of truth, of justice, and of mercy to mean by this well-understood phrase something unknown to his hearers, of a character the very opposite to what they had from his own teaching conceived, and conveying a doom unutterably greater? The idea is monstrous. God speaks to men only in the language of men. But hence it follows as a matter of course that the loss of life in the future world is the doom pronounced against sinners in the Old Testament.

But it is not only by this phrase "death," that the Old Testament describes the punishment of the ungodly. By every ex-

[1] Ps. 7: 13; Prov. 8: 36; 11: 4; Ezek. 3: 18; 18: 4; 33: 8.

UMI

aspirations for eternity it answers by the promise of eternal life through Christ Jesus. But there it stops. An essential immortality of the soul it denies as explicitly as it denies it to the body. To one being only—to God—does it allow to have life in himself: of one being only—God—does it allow immortality; *i. e.*, the absolute incapacity of death[1] to be an attribute.[2] And here, as in everything else, Scripture is the book of the highest reason. That which has had a beginning may have an end. That on which God has bestowed life he may and can inflict death. The highest intelligences as much as the lowest must depend on him for the continuance of their life. Let him withdraw his sustaining power and the mighty Archangel becomes a thing of nought as completely as the insect which dances in the sunbeams for an hour and then passes away forever.

Having removed all obstacles arising from an erroneous notion of the nature of the soul, we proceed to consider the direct proofs of our view. We will first advert to the testimony of the Old Testament. This indeed is by no means so clear, either as to the future of the redeemed or the lost, as the New Testament, but there are undoubtedly many places in it which speak of both.

We will first advert to the original conception of death. It was very early spoken of by God himself. "In the day that thou eatest" of the tree of knowledge, he said to Adam, "thou shalt surely die."[3] God explains his word to man—"dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."[4] God's definition of the death inflicted for the first transgression is frequently repeated in different words in the later Scriptures. Thus Paul tells us that it is the death which all men undergo, whether they are among the saved or the lost.[5] Such too was that death which Christ endured for human sin—the same death which the thieves beside him suffered, "even the death of the cross."[6] We have thus the original meaning of death clearly and explicitly displayed in Scripture. It did not mean life spent in pain, but the loss of the life which God first gave to man in Eden. Such was man's primitive idea of death. Such was the universal idea formed of it wherever men lived and died. In their own case and in that of the lower creatures, they saw it exemplified every day. The idea first presented by God was perpetuated by universal experience.

Language, we know, assumes a variety of meaning. Words

[1] *Athanasia.* [2] John 5: 26; 1 Tim. 6: 16. [3] Gen. 2: 17. [4] Gen. 3: 19. [5] Rom. 5: 12, 14, 17; 1 Cor. 15: 22. [6] Phil. 2: 8; Acts 5: 30; Rom. 6: 7, 8.

sometimes undergo so many subtle changes of sense, that their latter meaning becomes the direct opposite to their first. The word death has, however, remained true to its original import in its various applications. Thus, we have in Scripture the state of spiritual death, or the being "dead in trespasses and sins:" we have the expressions "dead to sin," "dead to the law:" in our catechism we have the phrase 'a death unto sin:' in ordinary life we speak of persons as being dead to certain passions. All such expressions are derived from material death, and are true to its original sense. They imply the departure of relations and feelings which once were living and strong—*their death.* To the universal sense imposed on death in all times and by all nations, there is but one exception, that given to it in the theology of a porton of Christendom. In that theology, and in that alone, death is made to mean its direct opposite—*life.*

But this late meaning attached by many Christians to the term death in one of its applications, namely: to future punishment, has not the smallest force as regards its use in the Old Testament. There the word must be taken in the sense stamped upon it and unaltered. There it is over and over again described as the end in the future world of obstinate transgressors. For such, God declares he has "provided the *instruments of death*:" of such as hate divine wisdom that Wisdom says "they that hate me *love death*:" to the wicked God saith "thou shalt surely die:" "the soul that sinneth it shall die."[1]

No one, we suppose, will apply such expressions to that death which all alike undergo as the children of Adam. They can only apply to future punishment. Death, then, according to the Old Testament, is to be after judgment the result of sin, as life is the result of righteousness. Can we suppose a God of truth, of justice, and of mercy to mean by this well-understood phrase something unknown to his hearers, of a character the very opposite to what they had from his own teaching conceived, and conveying a doom unutterably greater? The idea is monstrous. God speaks to men only in the language of men. But hence it follows as a matter of course that the loss of life in the future world is the doom pronounced against sinners in the Old Testament.

But it is not only by this phrase "death," that the Old Testament describes the punishment of the ungodly. By every ex-

[1] Ps. 7: 13; Prov. 8: 36; 11: 4; Ezek. 3: 18; 18: 4; 33: 8.

UMI

pression in the Hebrew language significant of loss of life, loss of existence, the resolution of organized substance into its original parts, its reduction to that condition in which it is, as though it had never been called into being—by every such expression does the Old Testament describe the end of the ungodly. "The *destruction* of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together:" "prepare them for the *day of slaughter*:" "*the slain* of the Lord shall be many:" "they shall go forth and look upon *the carcasses* of the men that have sinned:" "God shall *destroy* them:" "they shall be *consumed*:" "they shall be *cut off*:" "they shall be *rooted out of the land of the living*:" "*blotted out of the book of life*:" "*they are not.*"[1] The Hebrew scholar will see from the above passages, that there is no phrase of the Hebrew language, significant of all destruction short of absolute annihilation, which is not used to denote the end of the ungodly.

For the benefit of the English reader we will present a few instances of the meaning of some of these phrases in things which relate to this present life. There are several Hebrew words applied to future punishment translated by the word perish. *Ovad* is one of the most common of these. Let us see its use in things of which we are able to judge. When Heshbon was utterly cut off by the sword of Israel: when a prediction of extermination is pronounced against the house of Ahab: when the memory of the wicked has departed from the earth: when Esther apprehends her death at the hands of Ahasuerus; it is this word which is used: they have, or will, or may perish.[2] *Horas* is another term in frequent use for future punishment. What is its meaning in common life? When the altar of Baal was thrown down, stone after stone: when the strongholds of Zion were leveled to the ground: when a wall is broken down so that its foundations are discovered; this is the term used.[3] Again: God will *destroy* the ungodly. One Hebrew word for this is *tsomath.* It is used in the sense of utterly cutting off and destroying from a place.[4] Another Hebrew word is *shomad.* It is significant of utter extinction. When the women of the tribe of Benjamin had been slain: when the nations of Canaan disappeared before the sword of Israel: when Moab ceased to be a nation: this is the word used for their destruction.[5] Again: the wicked will be *cut off.*

[1] Is. 1: 28; 66: 16, 24; Jer. 12: 3; Ps. 28: 5; 37: 20; 73: 27; 37: 38; 52: 5; 69: 28; Job 27: 19. [2] Num. 21: 30; 2 Kings 9: 8; Job 18: 17; Est. 4: 16. [3] Judges 6: 28; Lam. 2: 2; Ezek. 18: 14. [4] *Furst. Gesenius*, Ps. 60: 4; 101: 5-8. [5] Judges 21: 16; Deut. 12: 30; Jer. 48: 42.

The Hebrew is *karath* in Nifal. What is its use in common life? When truth has become extinct from a sin-loving people: when weapons of war are broken in pieces: when life at the period of the flood perished from the earth: when the life of an offender against the law of Moses was taken; this is the word used: *they are cut off.*[1] By another word, *notats*, God threatens future destruction. In matters of this life it indicates destruction of an utter kind. When the infected house of the leper was cast down and dismantled: when the images of Baal were broken in pieces: when the stones of the altar of the sun were ground into powder—this is the word used for the process of destruction.[2]

We need go no further for the testimony of the Old Testament. By every term it has pointed out the punishment of the wicked as consisting, not in life, but in the loss of life; not in their continuance in that organized form which constitutes man, but in its dissolution, its resolution into its original parts, its becoming as though it had never been called into existence. While the redeemed are to rejoice in a life which knows no end, the lost are to be reduced to a death which knows of no awaking forever and ever.

It will be well here to answer an objection which may be made to this view of future punishment, viz: that in taking from it an eternity of consciousness and pain, we are in fact taking from it its character of eternity. It may be said that is not punishment at all which is not felt to be punishment. This is reasoning which will not stand examination. If eternal life be the life restored by Christ, then the loss of this life is a punishment of as enduring a nature as the eternal life itself. And here the first death affords a perfect analogy to the second. From the earliest records of our race, in every land, by men of every creed, by believers in and deniers of a future life, capital punishment has been reckoned as not only the greatest but the most lasting of all punishment. In fact, it is only because it is the most lasting that it is the greatest. The pain incurred in the process lasts but for a few moments. It is yet regarded as the longest punishment, because it has deprived the sufferer of every hour of that life which but for it he would have had. Its duration is supposed to be coextensive with the period of his natural life. "The laws," says Augustine, "do not estimate the punishment of a criminal by the

[1] Jer. 7: 28; Zech. 9: 10; Gen. 9: 11; Ex. 30: 33. [2] Lev. 14: 45; 2 Kings 11: 18; 23: 12.

pression in the Hebrew language significant of loss of life, loss of existence, the resolution of organized substance into its original parts, its reduction to that condition in which it is, as though it had never been called into being—by every such expression does the Old Testament describe the end of the ungodly. "The *destruction* of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together:" "prepare them for the *day of slaughter*:" "*the slain* of the Lord shall be many:" "they shall go forth and look upon *the carcasses* of the men that have sinned:" "God shall *destroy* them:" "they shall be *consumed*:" "they shall be *cut off*:" "they shall be *rooted out of the land of the living*:" "*blotted out of the book of life*:" "*they are not.*"[1] The Hebrew scholar will see from the above passages, that there is no phrase of the Hebrew language, significant of all destruction short of absolute annihilation, which is not used to denote the end of the ungodly.

For the benefit of the English reader we will present a few instances of the meaning of some of these phrases in things which relate to this present life. There are several Hebrew words applied to future punishment translated by the word perish. *Ovad* is one of the most common of these. Let us see its use in things of which we are able to judge. When Heshbon was utterly cut off by the sword of Israel: when a prediction of extermination is pronounced against the house of Ahab: when the memory of the wicked has departed from the earth: when Esther apprehends her death at the hands of Ahasuerus; it is this word which is used: they have, or will, or may perish.[2] *Horas* is another term in frequent use for future punishment. What is its meaning in common life? When the altar of Baal was thrown down, stone after stone: when the strongholds of Zion were leveled to the ground: when a wall is broken down so that its foundations are discovered; this is the term used.[3] Again: God will *destroy* the ungodly. One Hebrew word for this is *tsomath.* It is used in the sense of utterly cutting off and destroying from a place.[4] Another Hebrew word is *shomad.* It is significant of utter extinction. When the women of the tribe of Benjamin had been slain: when the nations of Canaan disappeared before the sword of Israel: when Moab ceased to be a nation: this is the word used for their destruction.[5] Again: the wicked will be *cut off.*

[1] Is. 1: 28; 66: 16, 24; Jer. 12: 3; Ps. 28: 5; 37: 20; 73: 27; 37: 38; 52: 5; 69: 28; Job 27: 19. [2] Num. 21: 30; 2 Kings 9: 8; Job 18: 17; Est. 4: 16. [3] Judges 6: 28; Lam. 2: 2; Ezek. 18: 14. [4] *Furst. Gesenius*, Ps. 60: 4; 101: 5-8. [5] Judges 21: 16; Deut. 12: 30; Jer. 48: 42.

The Hebrew is *karath* in Nifal. What is its use in common life? When truth has become extinct from a sin-loving people: when weapons of war are broken in pieces: when life at the period of the flood perished from the earth: when the life of an offender against the law of Moses was taken; this is the word used: *they are cut off.*[1] By another word, *notats*, God threatens future destruction. In matters of this life it indicates destruction of an utter kind. When the infected house of the leper was cast down and dismantled: when the images of Baal were broken in pieces: when the stones of the altar of the sun were ground into powder—this is the word used for the process of destruction.[2]

We need go no further for the testimony of the Old Testament. By every term it has pointed out the punishment of the wicked as consisting, not in life, but in the loss of life; not in their continuance in that organized form which constitutes man, but in its dissolution, its resolution into its original parts, its becoming as though it had never been called into existence. While the redeemed are to rejoice in a life which knows no end, the lost are to be reduced to a death which knows of no awaking forever and ever.

It will be well here to answer an objection which may be made to this view of future punishment, viz: that in taking from it an eternity of consciousness and pain, we are in fact taking from it its character of eternity. It may be said that is not punishment at all which is not felt to be punishment. This is reasoning which will not stand examination. If eternal life be the life restored by Christ, then the loss of this life is a punishment of as enduring a nature as the eternal life itself. And here the first death affords a perfect analogy to the second. From the earliest records of our race, in every land, by men of every creed, by believers in and deniers of a future life, capital punishment has been reckoned as not only the greatest but the most lasting of all punishment. In fact, it is only because it is the most lasting that it is the greatest. The pain incurred in the process lasts but for a few moments. It is yet regarded as the longest punishment, because it has deprived the sufferer of every hour of that life which but for it he would have had. Its duration is supposed to be coextensive with the period of his natural life. "The laws," says Augustine, "do not estimate the punishment of a criminal by the

[1] Jer. 7: 28; Zech. 9: 10; Gen. 9: 11; Ex. 30: 33. [2] Lev. 14: 45; 2 Kings 11: 18; 23: 12.

brief period during which he is being put to death, but by their removing him forever from the company of living men.'" This is readily applied to future punishment. The loss of every year of the life which the sinner might have had but for his sin is a punishment; and because the life is eternal, the punishment is eternal also.[1] There is here no straining of argument to make out a case: the argument is one which man's judgment has in every age approved as true.

A vast amount of misconception, and consequently of needless controversy, has arisen from the mistaken idea that eternal death is not properly eternal punishment. One class of reasoners, holding eternal punishment, think it necessary to argue against eternal death as not being its equivalent: while another class, holding more or less the doctrine of eternal death, feel bound to argue against eternal punishment from not perceiving that the eternal death which they hold is in truth its full equivalent. One class, again, imagine that in proving eternal punishment, they have proved eternal life in torments, and the other, that in overthrowing the notion of the latter, they have overthrown the former also.[2]

We now turn to the New Testament. We shall find it in perfect agreement with the Old. We will consider its testimony in the same order. Before, however, bringing forward its statements, we will make a few observations on a new feature here introduced, viz: the change of language adopted in the publication of the Gospel revelation.

We remark, then, that the writers of the New Testament not only must be supposed to follow the sense already fixed on the terms expressive of future punishment in the Hebrew Scriptures, but that they also give us another guarantee as to their meaning by their usage of the Greek tongue. The Gospel, revealed and recorded chiefly by Jews, is recorded, not in a provincial dialect, but in the language of the Roman world. We have here a guarantee as to their meaning, whose overpowering force on the present question we will show a little farther on. Paul, and Luke, and John, and Peter use a language which they had no hand in forming or moulding, but which was already provided for them to be the vehicle of their thoughts. They made no claim to alter

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, 21: 11.
[2] Irenæus, 5: 27; Witsius. *Economy of the Covenants*, I. 5: 42. *Eternity of Future Punishment*. G. Salmon, D. D., p. 1, &c.; *Eternal Punishment*. J. W. Barlow, M. A., p. 4, &c.

the world's tongue, but to alter the faith of the world through the medium of that tongue which the world used and understood, when they were children, learning the meaning of its words from their elders. The ordinary Classical Lexicon, not Lexicons of the New Testament, colored and tainted by theological opinion, is the true guide to the Greek of the New Testament. It is only where an idea new to the human mind is brought before it that we have a right to look for a new or a modified phrase whose sense is to be stamped upon it by the teachers of the novel truth.

We will first draw attention to the fact that the punishment of the wicked is just as frequently described *as their death* in the New Testament as in the Old, and this by the terms death or to die,[1] without the smallest effort to show that, in the use of these terms, any new theological sense was being introduced. These words, as all other words on this question, are used simply, without explanation, as words whose sense was long established. Thus our Lord, speaking of himself, says, "This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*:" and again he says, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *never die*."[2] In these passages he implies that they who do not believe in him *shall die*. What our Lord implies of the ungodly, Paul affirms of them: "If ye live after the flesh *ye shall die*."[3] Very frequently repeated are the passages in which the expression *death* is used for future puninshment. Thus our Lord says, "If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death:" Paul affirms of wicked works that their "end is death:" that "the wages of sin is death:" of those who perish he says that to such "we are the savor of death unto death:" James declares that "sin when finished bringeth forth death:" and that "he which converteth a sinner, shall save a soul from death:" John declares that the ungodly shall suffer "the second death."[4] We have thus, in repeated places, death described as the lot of the wicked in the life to come, nor is there in any one of them the least attempt made to show that death had any other than its usual sense, viz: *loss of life*.

Nor can it for one moment be maintained that such explanation was not required if by this death was intended the hitherto unknown sense of life in pain. It may please some of us, with the whole New Testament in our hands, to bring together certain

[1] *Thanatos, apothnesko.* [2] John 6: 50; 11: 26. [3] Rom. 8: 13. [4] John 8: 51; Rom. 6: 21, 23; 2 Cor. 2: 16; James 1: 15; 5: 20; Rev. 20: 14.

UMI

brief period during which he is being put to death, but by their removing him forever from the company of living men.'" This is readily applied to future punishment. The loss of every year of the life which the sinner might have had but for his sin is a punishment; and because the life is eternal, the punishment is eternal also.[1] There is here no straining of argument to make out a case: the argument is one which man's judgment has in every age approved as true.

A vast amount of misconception, and consequently of needless controversy, has arisen from the mistaken idea that eternal death is not properly eternal punishment. One class of reasoners, holding eternal punishment, think it necessary to argue against eternal death as not being its equivalent: while another class, holding more or less the doctrine of eternal death, feel bound to argue against eternal punishment from not perceiving that the eternal death which they hold is in truth its full equivalent. One class, again, imagine that in proving eternal punishment, they have proved eternal life in torments, and the other, that in overthrowing the notion of the latter, they have overthrown the former also.[2]

We now turn to the New Testament. We shall find it in perfect agreement with the Old. We will consider its testimony in the same order. Before, however, bringing forward its statements, we will make a few observations on a new feature here introduced, viz: the change of language adopted in the publication of the Gospel revelation.

We remark, then, that the writers of the New Testament not only must be supposed to follow the sense already fixed on the terms expressive of future punishment in the Hebrew Scriptures, but that they also give us another guarantee as to their meaning by their usage of the Greek tongue. The Gospel, revealed and recorded chiefly by Jews, is recorded, not in a provincial dialect, but in the language of the Roman world. We have here a guarantee as to their meaning, whose overpowering force on the present question we will show a little farther on. Paul, and Luke, and John, and Peter use a language which they had no hand in forming or moulding, but which was already provided for them to be the vehicle of their thoughts. They made no claim to alter

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, 21: 11.
[2] Irenæus, 5: 27; Witsius. *Economy of the Covenants*, I. 5: 42. *Eternity of Future Punishment*. G. Salmon, D. D., p. 1, &c.; *Eternal Punishment*. J. W. Barlow, M. A., p. 4, &c.

the world's tongue, but to alter the faith of the world through the medium of that tongue which the world used and understood, when they were children, learning the meaning of its words from their elders. The ordinary Classical Lexicon, not Lexicons of the New Testament, colored and tainted by theological opinion, is the true guide to the Greek of the New Testament. It is only where an idea new to the human mind is brought before it that we have a right to look for a new or a modified phrase whose sense is to be stamped upon it by the teachers of the novel truth.

We will first draw attention to the fact that the punishment of the wicked is just as frequently described *as their death* in the New Testament as in the Old, and this by the terms death or to die,[1] without the smallest effort to show that, in the use of these terms, any new theological sense was being introduced. These words, as all other words on this question, are used simply, without explanation, as words whose sense was long established. Thus our Lord, speaking of himself, says, "This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*:" and again he says, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *never die*."[2] In these passages he implies that they who do not believe in him *shall die*. What our Lord implies of the ungodly, Paul affirms of them: "If ye live after the flesh *ye shall die*."[3] Very frequently repeated are the passages in which the expression *death* is used for future puninshment. Thus our Lord says, "If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death:" Paul affirms of wicked works that their "end is death:" that "the wages of sin is death:" of those who perish he says that to such "we are the savor of death unto death:" James declares that "sin when finished bringeth forth death:" and that "he which converteth a sinner, shall save a soul from death:" John declares that the ungodly shall suffer "the second death."[4] We have thus, in repeated places, death described as the lot of the wicked in the life to come, nor is there in any one of them the least attempt made to show that death had any other than its usual sense, viz: *loss of life*.

Nor can it for one moment be maintained that such explanation was not required if by this death was intended the hitherto unknown sense of life in pain. It may please some of us, with the whole New Testament in our hands, to bring together certain

[1] *Thanatos, apothnesko.* [2] John 6: 50; 11: 26. [3] Rom. 8: 13. [4] John 8: 51; Rom. 6: 21, 23; 2 Cor. 2: 16; James 1: 15; 5: 20; Rev. 20: 14.

UMI

passages scattered here and there, to argue that combined they imply an eternal existence of pain, and that hence death, when spoken of the future of the wicked, must mean an eternal existence in pain. Whatever be their sense, they cannot be urged as obviating the necessity of explaining the term death, and similar terms, if any new sense was imposed upon them. Let us, for example, take the case of the Roman Church when Paul wrote to it. It had the Old Testament, *perhaps* one of the Gospels, probably some two or three of Paul's earlier epistles. Beyond this it had none of the other writings of the New Testament. Now Paul, when speaking of future punishment, always speaks of it here as death, except in one place where he speaks of it as "indignation and wrath and anguish," coming on the sinner from God, and in another as his being "fitted for destruction."[1] Yet he never explains his expression death. Why? Because he used it as it was used at Rome and by Romans, whether they were Christians or unbelievers. If he had used it in any other sense, he must have explained it. Neither Old Testament, nor any one of the Synoptic Gospels, nor any of Paul's earlier epistles, had imposed on the term the sense of life in pain.

As we proceed in our examination of the New Testament we will find ourselves confirmed in our view. To the second death we have given the usual meaning of loss of life hereafter, as death now means the loss of life here. We will now proceed to show that such is the meaning which the New Testament itself imposes on the term. In one place our Lord says, "He that findeth his life shall lose it:" in another he says, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life:" of the wicked, John says they are "not written in the book of life."[2] In these passages two different Greek words are used,[3] but both are certainly used in one and the same sense, viz: *life as opposed to death.* Let us consider the first of these passages. Our Lord affirms of certain characters that in the future retribution they "*shall lose their life.*" What is this life? It is neither spiritual life, nor joy, nor peace with God. These persons never had *this* life, or, if they had, had lost it in the present world. It is simply that *existence here* which they prolonged by their denial of Christ, and which martyrs lost by their confession of Christ. *It is the life which the good and the bad have in common.* It is that which both alike value and would prolong, but which one are content to

[1] Rom. 2: 8, 9; 9: 22. [2] Matt. 10: 39; John 3: 36; Rev. 20: 15. [3] *Psuche, zoe.*

lose for Christ, and which the other will not lose for Christ. That which these have here prolonged for a little while, he says, they shall lose in the future retribution; *i. e., they shall cease to exist.* Christ's words can have no second meaning. And this is agreeable to all Scripture. Eternal life is throughout spoken of as a gift to man through Christ: immortality is described as a blessing to be sought by man as much as the glory and honor of the future state.[1] Neither eternal life nor immortality are supposed to belong to us as our essential possession. Lost in Adam, they are restored in Christ, to be lost a second time by all who will not come to him, that they might have life.

And here we will refer for a moment to a passage in the history of Moses which strongly confirms our view. Moses intercedes with God that Israel may be forgiven, and asks that, if his prayer be not granted, he may be blotted out of the book which God had written.[2] This book can be no other than that book of life frequently referred to in Scripture, in which the names of the redeemed are written.[3] What then did Moses mean by his receiving the doom of sinners, and being blotted out of the book of life? We cannot for a moment suppose that he wished throughout eternity for a life of pain and moral corruption. He could only have wished for the utter cessation of a life which he then felt would be intolerable if his prayer were refused. If this be his meaning, it follows that what he petulantly asked for himself shall actually be the condition of the ungodly, for God in this place declared that what Moses sought for himself he will inflict on them—"Whosoever hath sinned against me him will I blot out of my book."

We now proceed to consider other expressions significant of future punishment. Of these none are so common as the Greek verb and noun[4] translated by the words destroy, perish, destruction. *None are more significant of the utter loss of life.* "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction," saith Christ: and Paul speaks of the ungodly as "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." Our Lord tells us to fear him "who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell:" and Paul affirms that "they who have sinned without law shall perish without law," that he is a "savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish."[5]

[1] John 10: 28; Rom. 2: 7; 6: 23. [2] Ex. 32: 32, 33. [3] Ps. 69: 28; Luke 10: 20; Rev. 20: 15. [4] *Apollumi, apoleia.* [5] Matt. 7: 13; Rom. 9: 22; Matt. 10: 28; Rom. 2: 12; 2 Cor. 2: 16.

passages scattered here and there, to argue that combined they imply an eternal existence of pain, and that hence death, when spoken of the future of the wicked, must mean an eternal existence in pain. Whatever be their sense, they cannot be urged as obviating the necessity of explaining the term death, and similar terms, if any new sense was imposed upon them. Let us, for example, take the case of the Roman Church when Paul wrote to it. It had the Old Testament, *perhaps* one of the Gospels, probably some two or three of Paul's earlier epistles. Beyond this it had none of the other writings of the New Testament. Now Paul, when speaking of future punishment, always speaks of it here as death, except in one place where he speaks of it as "indignation and wrath and anguish," coming on the sinner from God, and in another as his being "fitted for destruction."[1] Yet he never explains his expression death. Why? Because he used it as it was used at Rome and by Romans, whether they were Christians or unbelievers. If he had used it in any other sense, he must have explained it. Neither Old Testament, nor any one of the Synoptic Gospels, nor any of Paul's earlier epistles, had imposed on the term the sense of life in pain.

As we proceed in our examination of the New Testament we will find ourselves confirmed in our view. To the second death we have given the usual meaning of loss of life hereafter, as death now means the loss of life here. We will now proceed to show that such is the meaning which the New Testament itself imposes on the term. In one place our Lord says, "He that findeth his life shall lose it:" in another he says, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life:" of the wicked, John says they are "not written in the book of life."[2] In these passages two different Greek words are used,[3] but both are certainly used in one and the same sense, viz: *life as opposed to death.* Let us consider the first of these passages. Our Lord affirms of certain characters that in the future retribution they "*shall lose their life.*" What is this life? It is neither spiritual life, nor joy, nor peace with God. These persons never had *this* life, or, if they had, had lost it in the present world. It is simply that *existence here* which they prolonged by their denial of Christ, and which martyrs lost by their confession of Christ. *It is the life which the good and the bad have in common.* It is that which both alike value and would prolong, but which one are content to

[1] Rom. 2: 8, 9; 9: 22. [2] Matt. 10: 39; John 3: 36; Rev. 20: 15. [3] *Psuche, zoe.*

lose for Christ, and which the other will not lose for Christ. That which these have here prolonged for a little while, he says, they shall lose in the future retribution; *i. e., they shall cease to exist.* Christ's words can have no second meaning. And this is agreeable to all Scripture. Eternal life is throughout spoken of as a gift to man through Christ: immortality is described as a blessing to be sought by man as much as the glory and honor of the future state.[1] Neither eternal life nor immortality are supposed to belong to us as our essential possession. Lost in Adam, they are restored in Christ, to be lost a second time by all who will not come to him, that they might have life.

And here we will refer for a moment to a passage in the history of Moses which strongly confirms our view. Moses intercedes with God that Israel may be forgiven, and asks that, if his prayer be not granted, he may be blotted out of the book which God had written.[2] This book can be no other than that book of life frequently referred to in Scripture, in which the names of the redeemed are written.[3] What then did Moses mean by his receiving the doom of sinners, and being blotted out of the book of life? We cannot for a moment suppose that he wished throughout eternity for a life of pain and moral corruption. He could only have wished for the utter cessation of a life which he then felt would be intolerable if his prayer were refused. If this be his meaning, it follows that what he petulantly asked for himself shall actually be the condition of the ungodly, for God in this place declared that what Moses sought for himself he will inflict on them—"Whosoever hath sinned against me him will I blot out of my book."

We now proceed to consider other expressions significant of future punishment. Of these none are so common as the Greek verb and noun[4] translated by the words destroy, perish, destruction. *None are more significant of the utter loss of life.* "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction," saith Christ: and Paul speaks of the ungodly as "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." Our Lord tells us to fear him "who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell:" and Paul affirms that "they who have sinned without law shall perish without law," that he is a "savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish."[5]

[1] John 10: 28; Rom. 2: 7; 6: 23. [2] Ex. 32: 32, 33. [3] Ps. 69: 28; Luke 10: 20; Rev. 20: 15. [4] *Apollumi, apoleia.* [5] Matt. 7: 13; Rom. 9: 22; Matt. 10: 28; Rom. 2: 12; 2 Cor. 2: 16.

If we go to the Greek lexicon we will find that the terms used in these passages signify primarily *the destruction and loss of life.* For the present we confine our attention to their use in the New Testament. We will find it in strict agreement with the analogy of ordinary Greek writers. Let us take three of the above passages and consider them more particularly. Matt. 7: 13 runs thus: "Broad is the way that leadeth to *destruction*," and the next verse adds, "narrow is the way that leadeth unto *life*." Here it will be remarked that destruction is used as the opposite to life; *i. e.*, as the loss of life. Matt. 10: 28 runs thus: "Fear not them which *kill* the body, but are not able to *kill* the soul: but rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell." Here destroy is used as the equivalent to kill: that which man is able to do to our bodies but which he cannot do to our souls, viz: kill them, that God is able to do in hell both to body and to soul. And here the entire passage shows us that it is the loss of physical life, of existence, that is spoken of. The same connection of destruction with loss of life is seen in 2 Cor. 2: 15, 16: "We are a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that *perish*. To the one we are the savor of *death unto death*." These passages abundantly show us that the New Testament, where it speaks of the destruction of the wicked, follows the general analogy of the Greek language, and means the loss of life in hell.

In exact agreement with the foregoing are the other expressions used in the New Testament. Thus Paul adopts the teaching of the Old Testament as truly descriptive of future punishment, and sums it up in these words, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and *perish*."[1] The Greek word[2] here translated perish means properly "to become unseen, to disappear and be heard of no more."[3] The whole process is described in these pithy words; unbelievers will first see what they have rejected, will marvel at their folly, and then vanish out of existence.

Another Greek verb and Greek noun,[4] translated destroy, corrupt, perish, destruction, are frequently applied to future punishment, and are, when applied to men, properly significant of their death.[5] We would especially direct attention to the passage in 2 Pet. 2: 12, as affording indubitable proof that it is thus used in Scripture. Speaking of the ungodly, Peter says, "These as *natural brute beasts*, made to be taken and *destroyed*, shall *utterly perish in their own corruption*." The Greek reader will remark that the *same Greek word is used of the end of beasts and of the end of the ungodly.* We know what is the end of beasts taken and destroyed: even such Peter declares will be the end of the ungodly in the future life: *they shall perish there as beasts perish here.*

[1] Acts 13: 41. [2] *Aphanizo.* [3] *Phtheiro, phthora.* [4] 1 Cor. 3: 17; 2 Pet. 2: 12; Gal. 6: 8.

Another Greek term[1] sometimes used for future punishment, and translated destruction, is properly significant of death;[2] the wicked shall be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord."

We have brought forward a variety of phrases from the New Testament. We have now to consider the mighty bearing on their meaning of the fact that this New Testament *is written in the Greek tongue.* In that tongue all these phrases are to be found. Before the Gospel was preached, their meaning was fully established in the cultivated and the common mind of the human race. What is more—they were all in common use, and applied to, and their sense established, *with reference to this very point now under discussion.* The immortality of the soul was not a question for Jewish and Christian thought alone; it was the question of questions for the universal human mind. In particular, it was the question of questions in the various schools of Grecian philosophy. One of the noblest specimens of human reasoning, building its lofty superstructure on uncertain data, that has ever charmed, exalted, and, for our part we must add, bewildered the human intellect, is found in the dying discourse of Socrates to his friends, handed down to a deathless fame in the *Phædo* of Plato. Its object was to prove the immortality of the soul—that it could never cease to be—that through whatever changes it might pass, whatever pollutions it might suffer, whatever fearful torments it might endure, there was the deathless principle of the human soul which asserted an eternal life and utterly refused to die. It could never be, according to Plato, a thing of yesterday, an existence of the past but not of the present, a figure once jotted down in the book of life and then blotted out of it forever. In what terms is the denial of its mortality conveyed? In the very terms in which the punishment of the wicked is asserted in the New Testament. Where this latter says the soul shall die, Plato says it shall not die; where this latter says it shall be de-

[1] *Olethros.* [2] 1 Thess. 5: 3; 2 Thess. 1: 9; 1 Tim. 6: 9.

If we go to the Greek lexicon we will find that the terms used in these passages signify primarily *the destruction and loss of life.* For the present we confine our attention to their use in the New Testament. We will find it in strict agreement with the analogy of ordinary Greek writers. Let us take three of the above passages and consider them more particularly. Matt. 7: 13 runs thus: "Broad is the way that leadeth to *destruction*," and the next verse adds, "narrow is the way that leadeth unto *life*." Here it will be remarked that destruction is used as the opposite to life; *i. e.*, as the loss of life. Matt. 10: 28 runs thus: "Fear not them which *kill* the body, but are not able to *kill* the soul: but rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell." Here destroy is used as the equivalent to kill: that which man is able to do to our bodies but which he cannot do to our souls, viz: kill them, that God is able to do in hell both to body and to soul. And here the entire passage shows us that it is the loss of physical life, of existence, that is spoken of. The same connection of destruction with loss of life is seen in 2 Cor. 2: 15, 16: "We are a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that *perish*. To the one we are the savor of *death unto death*." These passages abundantly show us that the New Testament, where it speaks of the destruction of the wicked, follows the general analogy of the Greek language, and means the loss of life in hell.

In exact agreement with the foregoing are the other expressions used in the New Testament. Thus Paul adopts the teaching of the Old Testament as truly descriptive of future punishment, and sums it up in these words, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and *perish*."[1] The Greek word[2] here translated perish means properly "to become unseen, to disappear and be heard of no more."[3] The whole process is described in these pithy words; unbelievers will first see what they have rejected, will marvel at their folly, and then vanish out of existence.

Another Greek verb and Greek noun,[4] translated destroy, corrupt, perish, destruction, are frequently applied to future punishment, and are, when applied to men, properly significant of their death.[5] We would especially direct attention to the passage in 2 Pet. 2: 12, as affording indubitable proof that it is thus used in Scripture. Speaking of the ungodly, Peter says, "These as *natural brute beasts*, made to be taken and *destroyed*, shall *utterly perish in their own corruption*." The Greek reader will remark that the *same Greek word is used of the end of beasts and of the end of the ungodly.* We know what is the end of beasts taken and destroyed: even such Peter declares will be the end of the ungodly in the future life: *they shall perish there as beasts perish here.*

[1] Acts 13: 41. [2] *Aphanizo.* [3] *Phtheiro, phthora.* [4] 1 Cor. 3: 17; 2 Pet. 2: 12; Gal. 6: 8.

Another Greek term[1] sometimes used for future punishment, and translated destruction, is properly significant of death;[2] the wicked shall be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord."

We have brought forward a variety of phrases from the New Testament. We have now to consider the mighty bearing on their meaning of the fact that this New Testament *is written in the Greek tongue.* In that tongue all these phrases are to be found. Before the Gospel was preached, their meaning was fully established in the cultivated and the common mind of the human race. What is more—they were all in common use, and applied to, and their sense established, *with reference to this very point now under discussion.* The immortality of the soul was not a question for Jewish and Christian thought alone; it was the question of questions for the universal human mind. In particular, it was the question of questions in the various schools of Grecian philosophy. One of the noblest specimens of human reasoning, building its lofty superstructure on uncertain data, that has ever charmed, exalted, and, for our part we must add, bewildered the human intellect, is found in the dying discourse of Socrates to his friends, handed down to a deathless fame in the *Phædo* of Plato. Its object was to prove the immortality of the soul—that it could never cease to be—that through whatever changes it might pass, whatever pollutions it might suffer, whatever fearful torments it might endure, there was the deathless principle of the human soul which asserted an eternal life and utterly refused to die. It could never be, according to Plato, a thing of yesterday, an existence of the past but not of the present, a figure once jotted down in the book of life and then blotted out of it forever. In what terms is the denial of its mortality conveyed? In the very terms in which the punishment of the wicked is asserted in the New Testament. Where this latter says the soul shall die, Plato says it shall not die; where this latter says it shall be de-

[1] *Olethros.* [2] 1 Thess. 5: 3; 2 Thess. 1: 9; 1 Tim. 6: 9.

stroyed, Plato says it shall not be destroyed; where this latter says it shall perish and suffer corruption, Plato says it shall not perish, and is incorruptible. The phrases are the very same, only that what Plato denies of all souls alike, the New Testament asserts of some of the souls of men. But the discussion of the question was not confined to the school of Plato or to his times. Every school of philosophy took it up, whether to confirm Plato's view, or to deny it, or to heap ridicule upon it. All the phrases we have been discussing from the New Testament had been explained, turned over and over, handled with all the power of the masters of language, presented in every phase, so that of their sense there could be no doubt, nor could there be any one ignorant of their sense, before Jesus spoke, or an evangelist or apostle wrote. The subject had not died out before the days of Christ. It never could and never will die out. In every city of the Roman world were schools of Grecian thought in the days of the apostles. In every school the question before us was discussed in the phrases and language of the New Testament. In Jerusalem, and Rome, and Corinth, and Philippi, and Ephesus, and Thessalonica—wherever a Christian preacher opened his mouth to speak to man of his future destiny—were Platonists, or Epicureans, or Stoics, or Alexandrians, to whom the question of the soul's immortality was a question of constant thought, with whom the phrases in which the preacher addressed them as to their solemn future were familiar household words. Their language was his language, whether he spoke or wrote; their terms were his terms, and their meaning his meaning, else there were perplexities without a clue, logomachies without an end. And what did the Christian preacher declare, and the Christian writer write to that world-wide community which was ruled and bound together, not merely by the power of Roman will, but by the sceptre of the Grecian tongue? In sermon and disputation, in gospel and history and epistle and revelation, the propagators of the new religion asserted of the persons of the wicked—*i. e.*, of souls and bodies reunited at the resurrection—that which Plato had denied could happen to any soul. The cultivated intellect of the world, as well as the popular mind, read in the words of Christ, of Paul, of John, of Peter, of James, that what one of its sects of philosophy taught could happen to no soul, and what another taught should happen to all souls, the rising school of the Nazarene taught would happen to those whom its

phraseology described as unjust, wicked, unbelievers. Plato's noble conception, itself but the utterance of the longing of the human heart for its original inheritance, was taken up by the New Testament, only that it had here given to it its true direction, and had the eternal life after which it yearned connected with the God of life manifested in his Son. In Jesus Christ was that life which Plato fancied to exist in the soul itself. This life he would bestow upon his people, realizing more than the conception of Plato. But away from him there was no life. On those who would not come to him there would come finally—after stripes few or many—the end pictured for all by Epicurus. The Gospel brought together the fragments of truth scattered throughout human systems. Those who would soar it raises to God; those who would revel in the sty of sensuality it sinks to the state of the beasts that perish.

We will draw attention to one other phrase of the New Testament significant of future punishment.[1] It occurs in Paul's wish that he "were *accursed* from Christ for his brethren,"[2] a passage affording an exact parallel to the prayer of Moses already referred to. There can be no doubt that whatever Paul here means by being accursed from Christ is that condition in which the ungodly will really be.[3] What then *could* Paul here wish for for himself? Less of him than of almost any man that ever lived are we to suppose that he could for a moment wish for himself an eternal life of blasphemy and moral corruption, for such, according to the theory we are now opposing, is the condition of the reprobate throughout eternity. Far from the possible wishes of his holy mind must such a wish be. We can only suppose him to mean that he could suffer an eternal death, a blotting out of his own name from the book of the living, if by so doing he could gain for his kinsmen the life he had surrendered for himself.[4] This sense is in exact agreement with the use of the term accursed among the Greeks, by whom it was applied to any animal devoted to death, and removed out of the sight of men, in order to avert calamity. We will also find abundant confirmation of our view in the usage of the corresponding Hebrew term *khoram* in the Old Testament, when applied to things devoted to cursing.[5] Utter death where there was life, utter destruction

[1] *Anathema.* [2] Rom. 9: 3. [3] 1 Cor. 16: 22; Alford in Rom. 9. [4] Bengel in Rom. 9: 3.
[5] Deut. 7: 26; 13: 16; Josh. 6: 17-21; 7: 15-25.

stroyed, Plato says it shall not be destroyed; where this latter says it shall perish and suffer corruption, Plato says it shall not perish, and is incorruptible. The phrases are the very same, only that what Plato denies of all souls alike, the New Testament asserts of some of the souls of men. But the discussion of the question was not confined to the school of Plato or to his times. Every school of philosophy took it up, whether to confirm Plato's view, or to deny it, or to heap ridicule upon it. All the phrases we have been discussing from the New Testament had been explained, turned over and over, handled with all the power of the masters of language, presented in every phase, so that of their sense there could be no doubt, nor could there be any one ignorant of their sense, before Jesus spoke, or an evangelist or apostle wrote. The subject had not died out before the days of Christ. It never could and never will die out. In every city of the Roman world were schools of Grecian thought in the days of the apostles. In every school the question before us was discussed in the phrases and language of the New Testament. In Jerusalem, and Rome, and Corinth, and Philippi, and Ephesus, and Thessalonica—wherever a Christian preacher opened his mouth to speak to man of his future destiny—were Platonists, or Epicureans, or Stoics, or Alexandrians, to whom the question of the soul's immortality was a question of constant thought, with whom the phrases in which the preacher addressed them as to their solemn future were familiar household words. Their language was his language, whether he spoke or wrote; their terms were his terms, and their meaning his meaning, else there were perplexities without a clue, logomachies without an end. And what did the Christian preacher declare, and the Christian writer write to that world-wide community which was ruled and bound together, not merely by the power of Roman will, but by the sceptre of the Grecian tongue? In sermon and disputation, in gospel and history and epistle and revelation, the propagators of the new religion asserted of the persons of the wicked—*i. e.*, of souls and bodies reunited at the resurrection—that which Plato had denied could happen to any soul. The cultivated intellect of the world, as well as the popular mind, read in the words of Christ, of Paul, of John, of Peter, of James, that what one of its sects of philosophy taught could happen to no soul, and what another taught should happen to all souls, the rising school of the Nazarene taught would happen to those whom its

phraseology described as unjust, wicked, unbelievers. Plato's noble conception, itself but the utterance of the longing of the human heart for its original inheritance, was taken up by the New Testament, only that it had here given to it its true direction, and had the eternal life after which it yearned connected with the God of life manifested in his Son. In Jesus Christ was that life which Plato fancied to exist in the soul itself. This life he would bestow upon his people, realizing more than the conception of Plato. But away from him there was no life. On those who would not come to him there would come finally—after stripes few or many—the end pictured for all by Epicurus. The Gospel brought together the fragments of truth scattered throughout human systems. Those who would soar it raises to God; those who would revel in the sty of sensuality it sinks to the state of the beasts that perish.

We will draw attention to one other phrase of the New Testament significant of future punishment.[1] It occurs in Paul's wish that he "were *accursed* from Christ for his brethren,"[2] a passage affording an exact parallel to the prayer of Moses already referred to. There can be no doubt that whatever Paul here means by being accursed from Christ is that condition in which the ungodly will really be.[3] What then *could* Paul here wish for for himself? Less of him than of almost any man that ever lived are we to suppose that he could for a moment wish for himself an eternal life of blasphemy and moral corruption, for such, according to the theory we are now opposing, is the condition of the reprobate throughout eternity. Far from the possible wishes of his holy mind must such a wish be. We can only suppose him to mean that he could suffer an eternal death, a blotting out of his own name from the book of the living, if by so doing he could gain for his kinsmen the life he had surrendered for himself.[4] This sense is in exact agreement with the use of the term accursed among the Greeks, by whom it was applied to any animal devoted to death, and removed out of the sight of men, in order to avert calamity. We will also find abundant confirmation of our view in the usage of the corresponding Hebrew term *khoram* in the Old Testament, when applied to things devoted to cursing.[5] Utter death where there was life, utter destruction

[1] *Anathema.* [2] Rom. 9: 3. [3] 1 Cor. 16: 22; Alford in Rom. 9. [4] Bengel in Rom. 9: 3.
[5] Deut. 7: 26; 13: 16; Josh. 6: 17-21; 7: 15-25.

where no life existed, was the end of persons and things thus devoted to a curse.

In exact conformity with our view will be found the illustrations of future punishment in the Old and New Testaments. These are some of the illustrations of the former. The wicked shall be dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel: they shall be like the beasts that perish: like the untimely birth of a woman: like a whirlwind that passeth away: like a waterless garden scorched by an eastern sun: like garments consumed by the moth. They shall consume like the fat of lambs in the fire: consume into smoke: melt like wax: burn like tow: consume like thorns: vanish away like exhausted waters.[1] The illustrations of the New Testament are of the same character. The end of the wicked is there compared to fish cast away to corruption: to a house thrown down to its foundations: to the destruction of the old world by water, and that of the Sodomites by fire: to the death and destruction of natural brute beasts. They shall be like wood cast into quenchless flames: like chaff burnt up: like tares consumed: like a dry branch reduced to ashes.[2] Every one of these images point —not to the preservation of life in any state of pain, but to the loss of life, the utter blotting out of being and existence.

It cannot fail to be remarked how frequently *fire* is described as the agent of future punishment. It can only be taken in one or other of its uses, as the purifier or the destroyer of that submitted to its power. We think its invariable usage forbids us to take it as used as a purifying agent. It is therefore to be taken in its quality of a destroying agent. The power of consuming the thing which feeds its fury is the view of it presented in Scripture. Augustine indeed, in his labored defence of the doctrine of eternal life in hell, ransacks the realms of fact and fiction for substances and life which can resist, and are uninjured by the power of fire. This African Father tells us of worms existing in hot-springs, of salamanders living in the flames, of burning mountains which are not consumed, of diamonds resisting the heat of the furnace.[3] The ingenious idea of another African Father, Tertullian, is that fire as used by man and as employed by God are of quite opposite nature, for that while the former wastes in consuming, the latter repairs the waste which

[1] Ps. 2: 9; 37: 20; 49: 20; 58: 7, 8; 68: 2; Prov. 10: 25; Is. 1: 30; 33: 12; 51: 8.
[2] Matt. 13: 40; Luke 6: 49; 17: 27-29; 2 Pet. 2: 12; Matt. 3: 10-12; 13: 30; John 15: 6.
[3] *De Civ.* 21.

it produces.[1] A truer philosophy corrects this curious defence of African theology. In all God's known world, it tells us, *whatever life is hurt* in fire becomes extinct if continued in it: *whatever substance is injured* in fire is destroyed if it remains. And every one of the illustrations of Scripture refer to substances most readily consumed—to wood, and tow, and thorns, and fat of lambs.

But while we see one universal result, namely: death, to arise from future punishment, we are also told in Scripture of varying circumstances attendant on it which are necessary to be considered, in order to enable us to form an adequate conception of its nature and its variety.

Hell is not to all a sudden cessation of existence. There is life in that fearful prison, though it continues not forever. The children of the kingdom cast into its outer darkness gnash their teeth when they think of those who have come from east and west, and enjoy what they have lost; the unworthy guest at the marriage feast of Christ is in despair that he is not suffered to continue there; the despisers of the offers of redemption, be they Jews or Gentiles, behold their astounding folly, and marvel at its greatness; the unfaithful servant has time to bewail his want of fidelity, and the hypocrite to see that the portion he has chosen is a bitter and a hard one; ere all—sooner or later—sink into that state where wonder and remorse and pain and shame are lulled in the unconscious sleep of the second death.[2]

And here we must remark that all the warnings of weeping and gnashing of teeth are addressed to *the rejecters of proffered grace.* Not one of them is addressed to such as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah, Nineveh and Babylon, were in old times; to such as the men of Cabul and Bokhara, Teheran and Timbuctoo, are at the present day. The same holds good, we believe, of every especial warning found in Scripture.

Now it is doubtless in these circumstances that we will find room for that great distinction in guilt, and consequent punishment which Scripture repeatedly insists on. Its cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida—its children of the kingdom—its refusers of an apostle's message—its hypocrites trading on a false profession—its men aware of their Master's will—are held up as exceeding in guilt the ignorant offender, the undesigning sinner, the rejecter of an unauthenticated messenger, the uncovenanted trans-

[1] *Apol.* 48. [2] Matt. 8: 12; 22: 13; 24: 51; Luke 13: 28; Acts 13: 41.

UMI

where no life existed, was the end of persons and things thus devoted to a curse.

In exact conformity with our view will be found the illustrations of future punishment in the Old and New Testaments. These are some of the illustrations of the former. The wicked shall be dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel: they shall be like the beasts that perish: like the untimely birth of a woman: like a whirlwind that passeth away: like a waterless garden scorched by an eastern sun: like garments consumed by the moth. They shall consume like the fat of lambs in the fire: consume into smoke: melt like wax: burn like tow: consume like thorns: vanish away like exhausted waters.[1] The illustrations of the New Testament are of the same character. The end of the wicked is there compared to fish cast away to corruption: to a house thrown down to its foundations: to the destruction of the old world by water, and that of the Sodomites by fire: to the death and destruction of natural brute beasts. They shall be like wood cast into quenchless flames: like chaff burnt up: like tares consumed: like a dry branch reduced to ashes.[2] Every one of these images point —not to the preservation of life in any state of pain, but to the loss of life, the utter blotting out of being and existence.

It cannot fail to be remarked how frequently *fire* is described as the agent of future punishment. It can only be taken in one or other of its uses, as the purifier or the destroyer of that submitted to its power. We think its invariable usage forbids us to take it as used as a purifying agent. It is therefore to be taken in its quality of a destroying agent. The power of consuming the thing which feeds its fury is the view of it presented in Scripture. Augustine indeed, in his labored defence of the doctrine of eternal life in hell, ransacks the realms of fact and fiction for substances and life which can resist, and are uninjured by the power of fire. This African Father tells us of worms existing in hot-springs, of salamanders living in the flames, of burning mountains which are not consumed, of diamonds resisting the heat of the furnace.[3] The ingenious idea of another African Father, Tertullian, is that fire as used by man and as employed by God are of quite opposite nature, for that while the former wastes in consuming, the latter repairs the waste which

[1] Ps. 2: 9; 37: 20; 49: 20; 58: 7, 8; 68: 2; Prov. 10: 25; Is. 1: 30; 33: 12; 51: 8.
[2] Matt. 13: 40; Luke 6: 49; 17: 27-29; 2 Pet. 2: 12; Matt. 3: 10-12; 13: 30; John 15: 6.
[3] *De Civ.* 21.

it produces.[1] A truer philosophy corrects this curious defence of African theology. In all God's known world, it tells us, *whatever life is hurt* in fire becomes extinct if continued in it: *whatever substance is injured* in fire is destroyed if it remains. And every one of the illustrations of Scripture refer to substances most readily consumed—to wood, and tow, and thorns, and fat of lambs.

But while we see one universal result, namely: death, to arise from future punishment, we are also told in Scripture of varying circumstances attendant on it which are necessary to be considered, in order to enable us to form an adequate conception of its nature and its variety.

Hell is not to all a sudden cessation of existence. There is life in that fearful prison, though it continues not forever. The children of the kingdom cast into its outer darkness gnash their teeth when they think of those who have come from east and west, and enjoy what they have lost; the unworthy guest at the marriage feast of Christ is in despair that he is not suffered to continue there; the despisers of the offers of redemption, be they Jews or Gentiles, behold their astounding folly, and marvel at its greatness; the unfaithful servant has time to bewail his want of fidelity, and the hypocrite to see that the portion he has chosen is a bitter and a hard one; ere all—sooner or later—sink into that state where wonder and remorse and pain and shame are lulled in the unconscious sleep of the second death.[2]

And here we must remark that all the warnings of weeping and gnashing of teeth are addressed to *the rejecters of proffered grace.* Not one of them is addressed to such as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah, Nineveh and Babylon, were in old times; to such as the men of Cabul and Bokhara, Teheran and Timbuctoo, are at the present day. The same holds good, we believe, of every especial warning found in Scripture.

Now it is doubtless in these circumstances that we will find room for that great distinction in guilt, and consequent punishment which Scripture repeatedly insists on. Its cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida—its children of the kingdom—its refusers of an apostle's message—its hypocrites trading on a false profession—its men aware of their Master's will—are held up as exceeding in guilt the ignorant offender, the undesigning sinner, the rejecter of an unauthenticated messenger, the uncovenanted trans-

[1] *Apol.* 48. [2] Matt. 8: 12; 22: 13; 24: 51; Luke 13: 28; Acts 13: 41.

UMI

gressor, the men of Tyre and of Sidon. For the former are the many stripes; for the latter the few.[1] Our theory, and our theory alone, affords ample room for that great distinction in punishment which God will hereafter make.

And here we find a perfect analogy in the circumstances of the first death. This world is a world of death. All are here doomed to die, and all suffer death. In this there is no distinction. But in the circumstances of dying there is infinite variety. One man lives close upon a thousand years ere he yields to death: to another the first breath he breathes in this world is his last: between Methuselah and the infant of a moment's life lies every variety of duration. Again: one dies as though he were going to rest in sleep; another is racked with pains, year after year, by day and by night, which make him curse the weary life which is so hardly parted from: between these deaths lies every variety of comparative unconsciousness, inconvenience, uneasiness, weariness, and anguish. A like distinction we are positively told will exist in the second death, and our theory affords for it perfect scope. To some this death may be an instantaneous process, a momentary transition from one state to another, like the infant who opens his eyes on this world and then closes them forever. Here may be the amount of conscious pain for the myriads upon myriads of young and old who, in heathen and even in Christian countries from the inevitable moral darkness with which their circumstances had surrounded them, scarce, if at all, knew wrong from right. To others the process of the second death may be more or less lengthened until we arrive at the case of the greatest human offenders, or that more aggravated one of the spirits who fell from heaven and drew weaker man along with them in their fall. In our theory we see how it may be, as it certainly will be, more tolerable for some than for others in the day of judgment; how, while stripes many and sore fall on some, on others they may fall so few and so light as scarcely to be felt at all.

But undoubtedly, in a question of this kind, we may not shut our eyes to any testimony of Scripture. We are reasoning from Scripture as from a book of perfect truth; all whose utterances are equally true. Our argument up to this point has been, we consider, in perfect agreement with the passages brought under notice, simply and naturally understood, and has thus taken in

[1] Matt. 11: 22; 8: 12; 10: 15; Luke 20: 47; 12: 48 John 9: 41.

as perfectly consonant with it a large class of texts very commonly advanced as proving eternal life in hell. Such are all those texts which speak of weeping and wailing, of regrets and anguish, on the part of the damned. Undoubtedly they establish the fact of *life*, but they say nothing of its *duration*. They are consistent with its eternity, but they do not prove it. If any other class of texts establish the fact that life does not continue forever, these naturally fall in with this view, and merely complete the picture. As here life goes before death, and as here regrets and pains precede and produce death, so it may be in the future state.

But there are other texts which are very generally and, we fully admit, with great apparent force advanced, as proving fully, plainly, and unequivocally the doctrine of eternal pain and therefore of eternal life in hell. We must address ourselves to these texts, and see what they do say, whether they are for us or against us. But without any hesitation we assert that the number of texts which thus even seem to establish this view is very small. Mr. Keble's *Litany of our Lord's Warnings* diminishes to a very few petitions when fairly looked at. The figure which advances so portly in the distant obscurity shrinks into the lean and slippered pantaloon when seen close at hand. We have examined, so far as we know, every text in the Old and New Testament which speaks on the subject, and we deliberately say that among them all there appear but *five* passages which can with the smallest show of reason be advanced.[1] Every one of them highly figurative, every one of them veiled or glowing with the imagery of Isaiah or Revelation, it were but reason to interpret them, no matter what appeared to be their meaning, in accordance with the overpowering mass of Scripture testimony which has been advanced for the opposite view. We will, however, examine them in detail. We think they will be found either directly to confirm, or at the least to agree with, our view.

We will first consider Mark 9: 44. Speaking here of hell, and of those who will be consigned to hell, our Lord most solemnly, and with threefold repetition, pronounces their doom —"*their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*" It is on this text that Augustine, in his *City of God*, mainly relies for his view.[2] It was the text which weighed longest with us in producing a similar conviction. We take it now as teaching the

[1] Is. 33: 14; 66: 24; Mark 9: 43-48; Rev. 14: 10, 11; 20: 10. [2] Book 21: cap. 9.

gressor, the men of Tyre and of Sidon. For the former are the many stripes; for the latter the few.[1] Our theory, and our theory alone, affords ample room for that great distinction in punishment which God will hereafter make.

And here we find a perfect analogy in the circumstances of the first death. This world is a world of death. All are here doomed to die, and all suffer death. In this there is no distinction. But in the circumstances of dying there is infinite variety. One man lives close upon a thousand years ere he yields to death: to another the first breath he breathes in this world is his last: between Methuselah and the infant of a moment's life lies every variety of duration. Again: one dies as though he were going to rest in sleep; another is racked with pains, year after year, by day and by night, which make him curse the weary life which is so hardly parted from: between these deaths lies every variety of comparative unconsciousness, inconvenience, uneasiness, weariness, and anguish. A like distinction we are positively told will exist in the second death, and our theory affords for it perfect scope. To some this death may be an instantaneous process, a momentary transition from one state to another, like the infant who opens his eyes on this world and then closes them forever. Here may be the amount of conscious pain for the myriads upon myriads of young and old who, in heathen and even in Christian countries from the inevitable moral darkness with which their circumstances had surrounded them, scarce, if at all, knew wrong from right. To others the process of the second death may be more or less lengthened until we arrive at the case of the greatest human offenders, or that more aggravated one of the spirits who fell from heaven and drew weaker man along with them in their fall. In our theory we see how it may be, as it certainly will be, more tolerable for some than for others in the day of judgment; how, while stripes many and sore fall on some, on others they may fall so few and so light as scarcely to be felt at all.

But undoubtedly, in a question of this kind, we may not shut our eyes to any testimony of Scripture. We are reasoning from Scripture as from a book of perfect truth; all whose utterances are equally true. Our argument up to this point has been, we consider, in perfect agreement with the passages brought under notice, simply and naturally understood, and has thus taken in

[1] Matt. 11: 22; 8: 12; 10: 15; Luke 20: 47; 12: 48 John 9: 41.

as perfectly consonant with it a large class of texts very commonly advanced as proving eternal life in hell. Such are all those texts which speak of weeping and wailing, of regrets and anguish, on the part of the damned. Undoubtedly they establish the fact of *life*, but they say nothing of its *duration*. They are consistent with its eternity, but they do not prove it. If any other class of texts establish the fact that life does not continue forever, these naturally fall in with this view, and merely complete the picture. As here life goes before death, and as here regrets and pains precede and produce death, so it may be in the future state.

But there are other texts which are very generally and, we fully admit, with great apparent force advanced, as proving fully, plainly, and unequivocally the doctrine of eternal pain and therefore of eternal life in hell. We must address ourselves to these texts, and see what they do say, whether they are for us or against us. But without any hesitation we assert that the number of texts which thus even seem to establish this view is very small. Mr. Keble's *Litany of our Lord's Warnings* diminishes to a very few petitions when fairly looked at. The figure which advances so portly in the distant obscurity shrinks into the lean and slippered pantaloon when seen close at hand. We have examined, so far as we know, every text in the Old and New Testament which speaks on the subject, and we deliberately say that among them all there appear but *five* passages which can with the smallest show of reason be advanced.[1] Every one of them highly figurative, every one of them veiled or glowing with the imagery of Isaiah or Revelation, it were but reason to interpret them, no matter what appeared to be their meaning, in accordance with the overpowering mass of Scripture testimony which has been advanced for the opposite view. We will, however, examine them in detail. We think they will be found either directly to confirm, or at the least to agree with, our view.

We will first consider Mark 9: 44. Speaking here of hell, and of those who will be consigned to hell, our Lord most solemnly, and with threefold repetition, pronounces their doom —"*their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*" It is on this text that Augustine, in his *City of God*, mainly relies for his view.[2] It was the text which weighed longest with us in producing a similar conviction. We take it now as teaching the

[1] Is. 33: 14; 66: 24; Mark 9: 43-48; Rev. 14: 10, 11; 20: 10. [2] Book 21: cap. 9.

direct opposite to that which it is so often supposed to uphold. Now for the proof. This solemn declaration of Christ is not an original saying of his, but is quoted by him, word for word, from Is. 66 : 24. What it means in the mouth of Christ is what it meant in that of the prophet, and that we may more readily understand it we will quote it as it is found with its context in Isaiah's prophecy. Speaking of the redeemed of the earth Isaiah says, "They shall go forth, and look upon *the carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me, for *their worm* shall not die, neither shall *their fire* be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." A moment's glance shows us that both the worm and the fire are alike external to and different from the subject on which they prey, and also that what both prey upon *are not the living but the dead.* The fearful image is taken from the worm which feeds upon the carcass, and the fire which consumes it, and conveys the notion, not of life, but of its opposite, death. These most awful words of the prophet endorsed so solemnly by Christ assert a state of eternal death, and not one of eternal life, in hell, as the fate of transgressors in the world to come. They are fatal alike to the theories of Augustine and Origen.

The passage from Is. 33 : 14, if it refers at all to future punishment, is so similar to that just considered, as well as to those which will be considered, that a particular examination of it is not required. We pass on to the passage found in Revelation. These passages are all but identical, the chief difference being the different parties to whom they especially refer. Of the worshipers of the beast we are told in the former that they "shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and *the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever:* and they have no rest day nor night:" in the latter passage we are told that "the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and *shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.*"

These are undoubtedly very strong passages. They admit, however, we think, of a sense in perfect harmony with our view. We believe their sense to be this—that the future punishment of all consigned to hell will be of an eternal nature, and that its fearful effect—the plunging of its subjects in death and destruction—will ever remain visible to the sense of the intelligences of God's universe.

Now we will not try to establish this sense by examining the force of each word. We are by no means persuaded that we could in this way convince our opponents. We are not at all sure that language so mystic and figurative is properly capable of this dialectical analysis. We will proceed in another way which we hope will be satisfactory. We will present a passage from another Scripture, couched in equally strong language, in perfectly analogical terms, to which no such interpretation can be given as that attributed by our opponents to those passages in Revelation, but which does bear a sense such as we have put on them above. Our argument is that if one passage is capable of such an interpretation, and has such an interpretation put upon it by the Spirit who inspired it, we may safely allow these to have a similar one, and, reverencing the plainer testimony of other Scriptures, are bound to do so.

The passage we refer to is found in Jude 7: "*Even as Sodom and Gomorrah*, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, *are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" We want to arrive at the sense of this passage. We will first say what this suffering of the Sodomites is not. It does not then, in the first place, refer to anything they suffer, or may be thought to suffer, in *hades*, for of *hades* we know very little; and the condition of the Sodomites in *hades* is never alluded to in Scripture, and is therefore no warning example laid before men to learn from. In the second place, it does not refer to anything they may hereafter suffer in hell, for that is confessedly to them, as to all sinners, a future thing, whereas what the text speaks of is something which they were suffering when Jude wrote, and had suffered before he wrote, and which had long been a plain and palpable warning to ungodly men. If it does not refer to either of these, it is very evident what it does refer to. It means that punishment, open to human sight, which began when the fire from heaven descended on the guilty cities, and which has remained in force through all the succeeding generations down to our own time; and will continue while the present earth remains. *It is their overthrow in the days of Lot, and their abiding condition ever since*, which is here placed before the ungodly as an example of what awaits them hereafter if they imitate

direct opposite to that which it is so often supposed to uphold. Now for the proof. This solemn declaration of Christ is not an original saying of his, but is quoted by him, word for word, from Is. 66 : 24. What it means in the mouth of Christ is what it meant in that of the prophet, and that we may more readily understand it we will quote it as it is found with its context in Isaiah's prophecy. Speaking of the redeemed of the earth Isaiah says, "They shall go forth, and look upon *the carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me, for *their worm* shall not die, neither shall *their fire* be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." A moment's glance shows us that both the worm and the fire are alike external to and different from the subject on which they prey, and also that what both prey upon *are not the living but the dead.* The fearful image is taken from the worm which feeds upon the carcass, and the fire which consumes it, and conveys the notion, not of life, but of its opposite, death. These most awful words of the prophet endorsed so solemnly by Christ assert a state of eternal death, and not one of eternal life, in hell, as the fate of transgressors in the world to come. They are fatal alike to the theories of Augustine and Origen.

The passage from Is. 33 : 14, if it refers at all to future punishment, is so similar to that just considered, as well as to those which will be considered, that a particular examination of it is not required. We pass on to the passage found in Revelation. These passages are all but identical, the chief difference being the different parties to whom they especially refer. Of the worshipers of the beast we are told in the former that they "shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and *the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever:* and they have no rest day nor night:" in the latter passage we are told that "the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and *shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.*"

These are undoubtedly very strong passages. They admit, however, we think, of a sense in perfect harmony with our view. We believe their sense to be this—that the future punishment of all consigned to hell will be of an eternal nature, and that its fearful effect—the plunging of its subjects in death and destruction—will ever remain visible to the sense of the intelligences of God's universe.

Now we will not try to establish this sense by examining the force of each word. We are by no means persuaded that we could in this way convince our opponents. We are not at all sure that language so mystic and figurative is properly capable of this dialectical analysis. We will proceed in another way which we hope will be satisfactory. We will present a passage from another Scripture, couched in equally strong language, in perfectly analogical terms, to which no such interpretation can be given as that attributed by our opponents to those passages in Revelation, but which does bear a sense such as we have put on them above. Our argument is that if one passage is capable of such an interpretation, and has such an interpretation put upon it by the Spirit who inspired it, we may safely allow these to have a similar one, and, reverencing the plainer testimony of other Scriptures, are bound to do so.

The passage we refer to is found in Jude 7: "*Even as Sodom and Gomorrah*, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, *are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" We want to arrive at the sense of this passage. We will first say what this suffering of the Sodomites is not. It does not then, in the first place, refer to anything they suffer, or may be thought to suffer, in *hades*, for of *hades* we know very little; and the condition of the Sodomites in *hades* is never alluded to in Scripture, and is therefore no warning example laid before men to learn from. In the second place, it does not refer to anything they may hereafter suffer in hell, for that is confessedly to them, as to all sinners, a future thing, whereas what the text speaks of is something which they were suffering when Jude wrote, and had suffered before he wrote, and which had long been a plain and palpable warning to ungodly men. If it does not refer to either of these, it is very evident what it does refer to. It means that punishment, open to human sight, which began when the fire from heaven descended on the guilty cities, and which has remained in force through all the succeeding generations down to our own time; and will continue while the present earth remains. *It is their overthrow in the days of Lot, and their abiding condition ever since*, which is here placed before the ungodly as an example of what awaits them hereafter if they imitate

Sodom. This view is not first presented by Jude: it is frequently met with in the older Scriptures. Thus in Deut. 29: 23, the then present condition of Sodom and Gomorrah, "*brimstone and salt and burning, that is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth thereon,*" is held up as the resemblance to which the land of Israel will be reduced if they turn to idols. Similar allusions abound in Scripture.[1] In all of them we find the present unchanging condition of Sodom a favorite image to set forth a like state of similar cities in this life, just as Jude uses it to set forth the unchanging condition of the ungodly in the life to come.

What has been, and is, this state of Sodom? In the days of Abraham four rich and populous cities flourished in the plain of Jordan. On a sudden, fire descended from heaven, and after a period of terror, regrets, and pain, the inhabitants were deprived of life. They and their works were burnt up, and this ruined, lifeless, hopeless condition has remained to the present time. "The smell of the fire is still over the land," says Tertullian. The whole transaction conveys the idea of conscious pain for a time, followed by ruin and death for all time.

In what terms is this condition described? Sodom and Gomorrah—an expression especially including the people of these cities—are described as "*suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" They suffered such vengeance in Lot's day, and have suffered it ever since. *It is their eternal suffering from fire.* But when we come to think of the state thus described, what is it? It is not endless life in pain. Pain and life were over in a very short time in the sulphureous fire, but no inhabitant ever woke up to life and enjoyment again, nor were life and enjoyment ever seen again where the destruction fell: death and desolation have ever since reigned there.[2] This is, according to Jude, "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

We will not dwell upon the fact that this description of Jude, expressly stated to afford an example of future punishment, strongly confirms the theory already established. We advance it here as an illustration of Scripture language. The passages in Revelation are not one whit stronger in expression. The phrases "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever," and "they shall be tormented day and night forever," applied to the objects of future punishment, are in no ways more indicative of

[1] Is. 13: 19; Jer. 49: 18; 50: 40; 2 Pet. 2: 6. Josephus. *Jewish War IV.* 8: 4; Wis. 10: 7.

endless life and pain in hell than the phrase "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," applied to the past punishment of the Sodomites, is indicative of their having felt the pain of fire from Abraham's days to ours. The one idea, common and essential to both, is the eternity of the ruin which they bring upon themselves by sin. We will only add that this interpretation put on the passages in Revelation is required in order to bring that book into harmony with itself, since it, like other Scriptures, describes the future condition of the ungodly as a state of death and destruction, as a being blotted out of the book of life.[1]

We are here naturally led to consider what it is that is really meant by the terms eternal fire, unquenchable fire, so often applied to the fire of hell. We are not now considering the nature of the fire itself, whether it be identical with or analogous only to fire such as here consumes. What we are considering is whether, be this fire what it may, it continues throughout eternity to burn as it burns when the reprobates are first placed therein. The passage from Jude leads us to conclude that it only continues to burn *while it has anything to consume.* The fire of Sodom is called an eternal fire, but it only burned while aught remained of the guilty cities to be consumed. It could not be extinguished until then. Jordan poured upon it could not put out its flames; Abraham's prayers could not abate its force; mercy had put forward its last plea in the bosom of God. But when all had been reduced to ashes the fire went out, and the smoke ceased to rise, leaving behind an utter destruction which no lapse of time was to repair. It is thus we are to view the unquenchable fire of hell.

We are to consider that the term is one in common use. It is not confined to hell or peculiar to theology. It is constantly applied to fire burning here on earth, which is unquenchable, inasmuch as all human efforts cannot quench it, but which, when it has done its work of destruction, smoulders away and dies out. The classical scholar will remember the famous passage of Homer were the Trojans hurl unquenchable fire upon the Grecian ships, though but one of them was burnt, and that one only half consumed.[2] In the very same way it is constantly used in Scripture. When God in one place declares that his wrath against Jerusalem "shall not be quenched;" and in another that he will "kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall not be quenched,"[3]

[1] Rev. 3: 5; 11: 18; 17: 8; 20: 6. [2] Iliad 16: 123, 294. [3] Jer. 7: 20; 17: 27.

UMI

Sodom. This view is not first presented by Jude: it is frequently met with in the older Scriptures. Thus in Deut. 29: 23, the then present condition of Sodom and Gomorrah, "*brimstone and salt and burning, that is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth thereon,*" is held up as the resemblance to which the land of Israel will be reduced if they turn to idols. Similar allusions abound in Scripture.[1] In all of them we find the present unchanging condition of Sodom a favorite image to set forth a like state of similar cities in this life, just as Jude uses it to set forth the unchanging condition of the ungodly in the life to come.

What has been, and is, this state of Sodom? In the days of Abraham four rich and populous cities flourished in the plain of Jordan. On a sudden, fire descended from heaven, and after a period of terror, regrets, and pain, the inhabitants were deprived of life. They and their works were burnt up, and this ruined, lifeless, hopeless condition has remained to the present time. "The smell of the fire is still over the land," says Tertullian. The whole transaction conveys the idea of conscious pain for a time, followed by ruin and death for all time.

In what terms is this condition described? Sodom and Gomorrah—an expression especially including the people of these cities—are described as "*suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" They suffered such vengeance in Lot's day, and have suffered it ever since. *It is their eternal suffering from fire.* But when we come to think of the state thus described, what is it? It is not endless life in pain. Pain and life were over in a very short time in the sulphureous fire, but no inhabitant ever woke up to life and enjoyment again, nor were life and enjoyment ever seen again where the destruction fell: death and desolation have ever since reigned there.[2] This is, according to Jude, "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

We will not dwell upon the fact that this description of Jude, expressly stated to afford an example of future punishment, strongly confirms the theory already established. We advance it here as an illustration of Scripture language. The passages in Revelation are not one whit stronger in expression. The phrases "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever," and "they shall be tormented day and night forever," applied to the objects of future punishment, are in no ways more indicative of

[1] Is. 13: 19; Jer. 49: 18; 50: 40; 2 Pet. 2: 6. Josephus. *Jewish War IV.* 8: 4; Wis. 10: 7.

endless life and pain in hell than the phrase "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," applied to the past punishment of the Sodomites, is indicative of their having felt the pain of fire from Abraham's days to ours. The one idea, common and essential to both, is the eternity of the ruin which they bring upon themselves by sin. We will only add that this interpretation put on the passages in Revelation is required in order to bring that book into harmony with itself, since it, like other Scriptures, describes the future condition of the ungodly as a state of death and destruction, as a being blotted out of the book of life.[1]

We are here naturally led to consider what it is that is really meant by the terms eternal fire, unquenchable fire, so often applied to the fire of hell. We are not now considering the nature of the fire itself, whether it be identical with or analogous only to fire such as here consumes. What we are considering is whether, be this fire what it may, it continues throughout eternity to burn as it burns when the reprobates are first placed therein. The passage from Jude leads us to conclude that it only continues to burn *while it has anything to consume.* The fire of Sodom is called an eternal fire, but it only burned while aught remained of the guilty cities to be consumed. It could not be extinguished until then. Jordan poured upon it could not put out its flames; Abraham's prayers could not abate its force; mercy had put forward its last plea in the bosom of God. But when all had been reduced to ashes the fire went out, and the smoke ceased to rise, leaving behind an utter destruction which no lapse of time was to repair. It is thus we are to view the unquenchable fire of hell.

We are to consider that the term is one in common use. It is not confined to hell or peculiar to theology. It is constantly applied to fire burning here on earth, which is unquenchable, inasmuch as all human efforts cannot quench it, but which, when it has done its work of destruction, smoulders away and dies out. The classical scholar will remember the famous passage of Homer were the Trojans hurl unquenchable fire upon the Grecian ships, though but one of them was burnt, and that one only half consumed.[2] In the very same way it is constantly used in Scripture. When God in one place declares that his wrath against Jerusalem "shall not be quenched;" and in another that he will "kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall not be quenched,"[3]

[1] Rev. 3: 5; 11: 18; 17: 8; 20: 6. [2] Iliad 16: 123, 294. [3] Jer. 7: 20; 17: 27.

UMI

he means that his wrath was to continue till Jerusalem was destroyed, and the fire was to burn till its palaces were consumed. Then wrath ceased because it had spent its force, and the fire went out because it had eaten up all on which it could prey. So we are to understand that unquenchable fire which is the terrible fate of the lost. *Their fire is not quenched.* It preys upon them with relentless force. No cries on the part of the damned arrest it; no prayers ascend from the redeemed for the sin which they know to be unto eternal death: no further feelings of grace and pity in God's bosom interfere to check its course. It burns on, consuming, preying, reducing, until it has burnt and consumed all. When it has spent its force it dies out for want of food, leaving behind it the endless sign of the destruction which it has brought on fallen archangel, and angel, and man. *This is the second death.* But we can bear to look upon it *because it is death.* We are not looking upon a picture which would overturn reason and banish peace from all who beheld it. Life has left the realms of the lost. The reprobates felt, but do not continue to feel, the consuming flames. These prey upon the dead, and it is dust and ashes which cover the floor of the furnace of hell.

In Origen's view of the future, a view now fast spreading, we see the real cause of the emphatic, repeated, awful declarations of Scripture. That view, so pleasing to fallen human nature, was the idea against which the Spirit of God laid down in Scripture the warnings of everlasting destruction. Experience has proved the wisdom and necessity of this. Even in the face of these Scriptures men are found to advocate the hope of a restoration from hell. Far more than Augustine's theory does the view here maintained root out this false, delusive hope. So long as men believe that life is not extinguished in hell, so long they will nourish hope. They will cherish the idea that somewhere down through the ages, when the groans of hell have been beating sadly, ceaselessly, at the gates of heaven, the message of mercy and deliverance may again be sent down even as God used to send it to Israel of old, groaning beneath the bondage of Egypt, Philistia, and Canaan. Death extirpates all such hopes. God is not the God of the dead.

It has been doubtless remarked, from several expressions in this paper, that we hold that the ultimate fate of devils will be

the same as that of the reprobate. We have no doubt that such is the case, and all Scripture tends to that end. They share in that judgment which awaits the ungodly. The everlasting fire which consumes the wicked is that which has been prepared for the devil and his angels. They themselves look forward to be destroyed in hell. The pains which they dread are those which the ungodly will endure, and which result in death.[1] Nor can one single reason be advanced why God should not do this. The fire which is able to bring to dissolution that human spirit which man's power cannot reach is able also to bring to dissolution that angelic spirit which is probably far more tenacious of life. And we have thus in Scripture a far more satisfactory view of the final state of retribution than is afforded us by popular theology or poetic imagination. Devils are not the tyrants of hell. Devils do not exercise there an endless power over the victims of their fraud. They are only punished in hell with a severity proportioned to their guilt. With fearful reason they look forward to it, not as a scene of further triumph, but of unmitigated wo. They see, in all probability, the world whom they had seduced from God—the greater part of it speedily—all of it at one time or other—reduced to the original unfeeling elements of their being, while their stronger nature retains that vigorous life which makes it but the more susceptible to pain. The last being that retains the misery of existence may be that arch-fiend, Satan, the leader in heaven's rebellion, the prime mover in earth's falling away. When the last race of man has long ceased to feel—when his fellow-angels have, one by one, been reduced to the state of death—he may still survive, longing for the time when he too may lay aside a life which is only one of pain.

The view here advocated derives a further confirmation from its being in complete analogy with nature; i. e., with God's ordinary working. While those who seek God find him, and in finding him find life, and through his gracious plan of redemption are advanced in place and glory, we also find with regard to others lives innumerable lost, and in the case of angels an entire race blotted out of life. God and Nature are not here at strife.[2] If we see in Nature the gradual development of various types of being, we see also the law of death

[1] 2 Pet. 2: 4; Jude 6; Matt. 25: 41; Mark 1: 24; Luke 4: 34; Barn. 21; Justin Martyr. *Dial. Trypho*, pp. 284, 327. [2] Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, 54.

he means that his wrath was to continue till Jerusalem was destroyed, and the fire was to burn till its palaces were consumed. Then wrath ceased because it had spent its force, and the fire went out because it had eaten up all on which it could prey. So we are to understand that unquenchable fire which is the terrible fate of the lost. *Their fire is not quenched.* It preys upon them with relentless force. No cries on the part of the damned arrest it; no prayers ascend from the redeemed for the sin which they know to be unto eternal death: no further feelings of grace and pity in God's bosom interfere to check its course. It burns on, consuming, preying, reducing, until it has burnt and consumed all. When it has spent its force it dies out for want of food, leaving behind it the endless sign of the destruction which it has brought on fallen archangel, and angel, and man. *This is the second death.* But we can bear to look upon it *because it is death.* We are not looking upon a picture which would overturn reason and banish peace from all who beheld it. Life has left the realms of the lost. The reprobates felt, but do not continue to feel, the consuming flames. These prey upon the dead, and it is dust and ashes which cover the floor of the furnace of hell.

In Origen's view of the future, a view now fast spreading, we see the real cause of the emphatic, repeated, awful declarations of Scripture. That view, so pleasing to fallen human nature, was the idea against which the Spirit of God laid down in Scripture the warnings of everlasting destruction. Experience has proved the wisdom and necessity of this. Even in the face of these Scriptures men are found to advocate the hope of a restoration from hell. Far more than Augustine's theory does the view here maintained root out this false, delusive hope. So long as men believe that life is not extinguished in hell, so long they will nourish hope. They will cherish the idea that somewhere down through the ages, when the groans of hell have been beating sadly, ceaselessly, at the gates of heaven, the message of mercy and deliverance may again be sent down even as God used to send it to Israel of old, groaning beneath the bondage of Egypt, Philistia, and Canaan. Death extirpates all such hopes. God is not the God of the dead.

It has been doubtless remarked, from several expressions in this paper, that we hold that the ultimate fate of devils will be

the same as that of the reprobate. We have no doubt that such is the case, and all Scripture tends to that end. They share in that judgment which awaits the ungodly. The everlasting fire which consumes the wicked is that which has been prepared for the devil and his angels. They themselves look forward to be destroyed in hell. The pains which they dread are those which the ungodly will endure, and which result in death.[1] Nor can one single reason be advanced why God should not do this. The fire which is able to bring to dissolution that human spirit which man's power cannot reach is able also to bring to dissolution that angelic spirit which is probably far more tenacious of life. And we have thus in Scripture a far more satisfactory view of the final state of retribution than is afforded us by popular theology or poetic imagination. Devils are not the tyrants of hell. Devils do not exercise there an endless power over the victims of their fraud. They are only punished in hell with a severity proportioned to their guilt. With fearful reason they look forward to it, not as a scene of further triumph, but of unmitigated wo. They see, in all probability, the world whom they had seduced from God—the greater part of it speedily—all of it at one time or other—reduced to the original unfeeling elements of their being, while their stronger nature retains that vigorous life which makes it but the more susceptible to pain. The last being that retains the misery of existence may be that arch-fiend, Satan, the leader in heaven's rebellion, the prime mover in earth's falling away. When the last race of man has long ceased to feel—when his fellow-angels have, one by one, been reduced to the state of death—he may still survive, longing for the time when he too may lay aside a life which is only one of pain.

The view here advocated derives a further confirmation from its being in complete analogy with nature; i. e., with God's ordinary working. While those who seek God find him, and in finding him find life, and through his gracious plan of redemption are advanced in place and glory, we also find with regard to others lives innumerable lost, and in the case of angels an entire race blotted out of life. God and Nature are not here at strife.[2] If we see in Nature the gradual development of various types of being, we see also the law of death

[1] 2 Pet. 2: 4; Jude 6; Matt. 25: 41; Mark 1: 24; Luke 4: 34; Barn. 21; Justin Martyr. *Dial. Trypho*, pp. 284, 327. [2] Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, 54.

in ceaseless operation. Of fifty seeds, but one may bear fruit: of the lower animals, death after life is the universal law: whole races of living things have long ceased to exist.

> From scarped cliff and quarried stone,
> She cries, a thousand types are gone.

In our view, God does but apply to higher races for their sin that which he has applied to lower races who knew no sin. The grand distinction between these and us is, that we may see and know God, who is life and the source of all lesser life. If we turn from him we turn from life: we deny and renounce our real distinction, and are treated as that which we have made ourselves to become. In the myriads of human beings reduced in hell to death, in the extinction of the fallen angels, we do but find a particular application of a universal law. Lower creatures know not God, and fade away out of life. Higher intelligences knew him, turned from him forever, or refused to return, made themselves like the beasts, and like beasts are treated. Hell will add its fossil remains to those of the quarries of the earth.

As yet, we have made no use of any considerations arising from the question of Divine justice, either in favor of our own view or as opposed to its opposite. We wished to discuss the statements of Scripture without prejudice. Having done so, we will use this latter argument without any scruple. It is indeed said that we are not able to judge of God's ways, and this, no doubt, is often true; but it is true only of those dealings of his with us, with which we are imperfectly acquainted, or which, from their nature, are above our comprehension. The present subject belongs to neither of these categories. Future punishment is a matter fully set before us. We are told its cause and its nature; told to ponder on and study it. We are not treated as children incapable of forming an opinion as to what is just or unjust in God. Called upon to love, respect, and confide in him, we must be capable of judging of his character, of his love, his mercy, his wisdom, his justice. He has himself appealed to us to do so, appealed, not merely to his faithful people, but to those who are alienated from him.[1] In the human breast, there is a true sense of what is just, and God not only allows it, but insists upon its exercise toward himself. In this question of future punishment, we have the highest case on which any tribunal

[1] Ezek. 18: 29.

shall have ever sat, and we may be sure that the Judge of all the earth will do right, not merely in his own eyes, but in those of all his intelligent creation, of the angels who stand around the throne, of the redeemed who rejoice in their acceptance, of the very damned who listen to their sentence.

What is our question? It is this: Is pain, inflicted through eternity, endured without any hope of an end, no nearer to its close when numberless cycles have passed than when the first groan was uttered? is such pain *a just punishment* for any conceivable amount of sin committed by the worst of men? Man did not ask for life, it was given him without his knowledge or consent. Can any abuse of this unasked-for gift justify the recompense of an eternal existence spent in unending agony?

We must put the question on its proper grounds. The ablest modern defenders of eternal life in hell have put it on a false issue. They have done so in two main respects, urged on by their inability to justify their theory in its naked light. The first of these we will give in the words of William Archer Butler, whose view is adopted by Dr. Salmon in the *Sermons* already referred to. "The *punishments of hell*," says Butler, "are but the perpetual vengeance that accompanies *the sins of hell*. An eternity of wickedness brings with it an eternity of wo. The sinner is to suffer for everlasting, but it is *because the sin itself is as everlasting as the suffering*."[1]

Now it is sufficient to say of this view, that it contradicts the Scripture. Not once, or twice, but over and over again, it tells us that *the punishment of the future is for the sins of the present time*.[2] Man's conduct here, according to the Bible, is the full, sufficient ground for his punishment hereafter. If we think it too great, we are not at liberty to throw in the sins of the future, real or imaginary, to justify the punishment of the future. If we cannot defend man's future treatment as being a just award for his present conduct we cannot justify it at all. It is a piece of cool effrontery for us to present as a reason for God's conduct what God has not presented himself when explaining to man his judicial system.

Nor does it relieve God in the smallest measure from the charge of harshness to say that future punishment will but follow that law of nature which inextricably links together sin and

[1] W. A. Butler's *Sermons*, 2nd series, on *Everlasting Punishment*; Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, p. 10; Dwight's *Theology*, ser. 167. [2] Matt. 25: 41, 42; Rom. 2: 6; 2 Cor. 5: 10.

UMI

in ceaseless operation. Of fifty seeds, but one may bear fruit: of the lower animals, death after life is the universal law: whole races of living things have long ceased to exist.

> From scarped cliff and quarried stone,
> She cries, a thousand types are gone.

In our view, God does but apply to higher races for their sin that which he has applied to lower races who knew no sin. The grand distinction between these and us is, that we may see and know God, who is life and the source of all lesser life. If we turn from him we turn from life: we deny and renounce our real distinction, and are treated as that which we have made ourselves to become. In the myriads of human beings reduced in hell to death, in the extinction of the fallen angels, we do but find a particular application of a universal law. Lower creatures know not God, and fade away out of life. Higher intelligences knew him, turned from him forever, or refused to return, made themselves like the beasts, and like beasts are treated. Hell will add its fossil remains to those of the quarries of the earth.

As yet, we have made no use of any considerations arising from the question of Divine justice, either in favor of our own view or as opposed to its opposite. We wished to discuss the statements of Scripture without prejudice. Having done so, we will use this latter argument without any scruple. It is indeed said that we are not able to judge of God's ways, and this, no doubt, is often true; but it is true only of those dealings of his with us, with which we are imperfectly acquainted, or which, from their nature, are above our comprehension. The present subject belongs to neither of these categories. Future punishment is a matter fully set before us. We are told its cause and its nature; told to ponder on and study it. We are not treated as children incapable of forming an opinion as to what is just or unjust in God. Called upon to love, respect, and confide in him, we must be capable of judging of his character, of his love, his mercy, his wisdom, his justice. He has himself appealed to us to do so, appealed, not merely to his faithful people, but to those who are alienated from him.[1] In the human breast, there is a true sense of what is just, and God not only allows it, but insists upon its exercise toward himself. In this question of future punishment, we have the highest case on which any tribunal

[1] Ezek. 18: 29.

shall have ever sat, and we may be sure that the Judge of all the earth will do right, not merely in his own eyes, but in those of all his intelligent creation, of the angels who stand around the throne, of the redeemed who rejoice in their acceptance, of the very damned who listen to their sentence.

What is our question? It is this: Is pain, inflicted through eternity, endured without any hope of an end, no nearer to its close when numberless cycles have passed than when the first groan was uttered? is such pain *a just punishment* for any conceivable amount of sin committed by the worst of men? Man did not ask for life, it was given him without his knowledge or consent. Can any abuse of this unasked-for gift justify the recompense of an eternal existence spent in unending agony?

We must put the question on its proper grounds. The ablest modern defenders of eternal life in hell have put it on a false issue. They have done so in two main respects, urged on by their inability to justify their theory in its naked light. The first of these we will give in the words of William Archer Butler, whose view is adopted by Dr. Salmon in the *Sermons* already referred to. "The *punishments of hell*," says Butler, "are but the perpetual vengeance that accompanies *the sins of hell*. An eternity of wickedness brings with it an eternity of wo. The sinner is to suffer for everlasting, but it is *because the sin itself is as everlasting as the suffering*."[1]

Now it is sufficient to say of this view, that it contradicts the Scripture. Not once, or twice, but over and over again, it tells us that *the punishment of the future is for the sins of the present time*.[2] Man's conduct here, according to the Bible, is the full, sufficient ground for his punishment hereafter. If we think it too great, we are not at liberty to throw in the sins of the future, real or imaginary, to justify the punishment of the future. If we cannot defend man's future treatment as being a just award for his present conduct we cannot justify it at all. It is a piece of cool effrontery for us to present as a reason for God's conduct what God has not presented himself when explaining to man his judicial system.

Nor does it relieve God in the smallest measure from the charge of harshness to say that future punishment will but follow that law of nature which inextricably links together sin and

[1] W. A. Butler's *Sermons*, 2nd series, on *Everlasting Punishment*; Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, p. 10; Dwight's *Theology*, ser. 167. [2] Matt. 25: 41, 42; Rom. 2: 6; 2 Cor. 5: 10.

UMI

misery.[1] We will not allow the believer to shield himself under the cant of modern infidelity. The laws of nature are the laws of God. For all their consequences, after they have worked their uniform work for ages, he is just as responsible as when he first ordained them or as when he departs from them by miraculous interference. If the laws of nature were to bring on the sinner a punishment greater than his sin deserved, it is God himself who would be doing so.

The simple question then is, Could man by any conduct here deserve to suffer through eternity pain and torment to which only the worst pain he suffers here can afford a true parallel? Would the agonies to which the martyr was subjected for an hour be only sufficient for the sinner if drawn out through the eternal age? Would it be just in God to inflict this on any single creature of his hand, on any being who would never have had life at all if the Maker had not called him from his clay? The verdict of the human heart—in its fierce denial—in its secret recoil—answers—No. "Eternal pain," says Augustine, "seems harsh and unjust to human sense." "With the majority of men of the world," says Butler, "this doctrine seems, when they think at all about it, monstrous, disproportioned, impossible." It seems so, in the same writer's mind, to others besides men of the world, to men who do not fear this doom for themselves; it would "blanch the intellect," reduce the mind of the Christian to a state of idiotcy, deprive him of life, were he but adequately to conceive it."[2] If God were now to ask man whether his conduct on this hypothesis were just, man would reply that it was not.

The history of human religious thought shows man's ineradicable sense of the burning wrong of this fearful theory. If Plato taught a *tartarus* with its fiery streams whence none could come forth, he taught it for an infinitesimally small portion of men. For most, even for the homicide, the parricide, and the matricide, he had his Acherusian lake, whence, after a purgative process, they issued forth again to the upper air. If Augustine adopted his great Master's abode of unending pain, he adopted also his purgatory from whence there was a way to heaven. If the Church of Rome has sanctioned the theory of Augustine, she practically holds out its terrors only to those without her pale of safety; for her own millions she has, at the worst, the fires of a finite period. The assertion of Augustine's hell did but drive the gentler mind

[1] Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, p. 9. [2] *City of God* 21 : 12; Butler's *Sermons*, pp. 378, 383.

of Origen to the notion of a wider purgatory than Augustine's, where even devils should be prepared to resume their place in heaven. The prophet of Mecca rejected purgatory, and asserted the hell of Augustine, but this was only for infidels; he had paradise and the houris for the true believers. The churches of the Reformation have generally followed Augustine in his hell and denied his purgatory, but at all times within their bosom has been a struggle against the dominant doctrine, and at best it has only commanded a sullen, uncheerful assent.[1] The modern mind, shaken in religious faith, denies the inspiration of a book which is supposed to teach this monstrous creed. With those who will not throw away their faith in man's future, the theory of Origen, with all its consequences, bids fair, if only confronted with the fearful nightmare of Augustine, to take the place which the authority of the latter father has so long imposed upon the Church. The modern defenders of Augustine's theory shrink from putting forward a vindication of it in its plain and hideous aspect. One after another of the arguments on which it has heretofore been defended they have abandoned as unworthy of their reason, or abhorrent to their sense of justice.[2] Their sole reliance is on some half-dozen texts of Scripture which seem to them to teach it, and these they put forward without daring to say one bold word for the justice of their cause.

Our view needs no vindication, reduces us to no subterfuge to escape its consequences. By it the next life's dealings with the sinner will but follow the analogy of this. He who scans the course of nature may by it anticipate that future course which Revelation opens to our view. According to it *God's ways with the sinner are equal.* They are severe, but they are just. They are full of awe, but they can be contemplated with calmness. Their issue in eternal death, if it brings the sigh of sadness, brings also the deep, full breathing of an infinite relief. We require neither the purgatory of Augustine, nor the universal restoration of Origen. Looking on the calmed face of death we can say—"it is well." The woes, the agony, the despair of life are passed away from its features with the sin that produced them.

We will say but a few words more upon the great moral mystery of the world, *the existence of evil.* We feel we tread in a region of mist and shadow; we will tread slowly and with careful step. We pretend not to account for its origin. We remember,

[1] Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, pref. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 9, 47.

UMI

misery.[1] We will not allow the believer to shield himself under the cant of modern infidelity. The laws of nature are the laws of God. For all their consequences, after they have worked their uniform work for ages, he is just as responsible as when he first ordained them or as when he departs from them by miraculous interference. If the laws of nature were to bring on the sinner a punishment greater than his sin deserved, it is God himself who would be doing so.

The simple question then is, Could man by any conduct here deserve to suffer through eternity pain and torment to which only the worst pain he suffers here can afford a true parallel? Would the agonies to which the martyr was subjected for an hour be only sufficient for the sinner if drawn out through the eternal age? Would it be just in God to inflict this on any single creature of his hand, on any being who would never have had life at all if the Maker had not called him from his clay? The verdict of the human heart—in its fierce denial—in its secret recoil—answers—No. "Eternal pain," says Augustine, "seems harsh and unjust to human sense." "With the majority of men of the world," says Butler, "this doctrine seems, when they think at all about it, monstrous, disproportioned, impossible." It seems so, in the same writer's mind, to others besides men of the world, to men who do not fear this doom for themselves; it would "blanch the intellect," reduce the mind of the Christian to a state of idiotcy, deprive him of life, were he but adequately to conceive it."[2] If God were now to ask man whether his conduct on this hypothesis were just, man would reply that it was not.

The history of human religious thought shows man's ineradicable sense of the burning wrong of this fearful theory. If Plato taught a *tartarus* with its fiery streams whence none could come forth, he taught it for an infinitesimally small portion of men. For most, even for the homicide, the parricide, and the matricide, he had his Acherusian lake, whence, after a purgative process, they issued forth again to the upper air. If Augustine adopted his great Master's abode of unending pain, he adopted also his purgatory from whence there was a way to heaven. If the Church of Rome has sanctioned the theory of Augustine, she practically holds out its terrors only to those without her pale of safety; for her own millions she has, at the worst, the fires of a finite period. The assertion of Augustine's hell did but drive the gentler mind

[1] Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, p. 9. [2] *City of God* 21 : 12; Butler's *Sermons*, pp. 378, 383.

of Origen to the notion of a wider purgatory than Augustine's, where even devils should be prepared to resume their place in heaven. The prophet of Mecca rejected purgatory, and asserted the hell of Augustine, but this was only for infidels; he had paradise and the houris for the true believers. The churches of the Reformation have generally followed Augustine in his hell and denied his purgatory, but at all times within their bosom has been a struggle against the dominant doctrine, and at best it has only commanded a sullen, uncheerful assent.[1] The modern mind, shaken in religious faith, denies the inspiration of a book which is supposed to teach this monstrous creed. With those who will not throw away their faith in man's future, the theory of Origen, with all its consequences, bids fair, if only confronted with the fearful nightmare of Augustine, to take the place which the authority of the latter father has so long imposed upon the Church. The modern defenders of Augustine's theory shrink from putting forward a vindication of it in its plain and hideous aspect. One after another of the arguments on which it has heretofore been defended they have abandoned as unworthy of their reason, or abhorrent to their sense of justice.[2] Their sole reliance is on some half-dozen texts of Scripture which seem to them to teach it, and these they put forward without daring to say one bold word for the justice of their cause.

Our view needs no vindication, reduces us to no subterfuge to escape its consequences. By it the next life's dealings with the sinner will but follow the analogy of this. He who scans the course of nature may by it anticipate that future course which Revelation opens to our view. According to it *God's ways with the sinner are equal.* They are severe, but they are just. They are full of awe, but they can be contemplated with calmness. Their issue in eternal death, if it brings the sigh of sadness, brings also the deep, full breathing of an infinite relief. We require neither the purgatory of Augustine, nor the universal restoration of Origen. Looking on the calmed face of death we can say—"it is well." The woes, the agony, the despair of life are passed away from its features with the sin that produced them.

We will say but a few words more upon the great moral mystery of the world, *the existence of evil.* We feel we tread in a region of mist and shadow; we will tread slowly and with careful step. We pretend not to account for its origin. We remember,

[1] Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, pref. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 9, 47.

UMI

in lectures that ought to have been given to the world, that one of the foremost men of the present day gave expression to the thought that the origin of evil must ever remain above the comprehension of the finite mind. But this is an article of our Christian faith, that evil had an origin.[1] It is not from everlasting, else Manichæism were true and not a heresy. It is therefore no essential part of the constitution of the universe. It is not more essential to its future than to its past. If it must be *to* eternity it must have been *from* eternity. It is neither: it is a thing of time. We can imagine the ages to come to roll on ignorant of evil as were those past ages before the archangel fell. It may be that once more it will be the peculiar attribute of Godhead to know both good and evil: the blessedness of creation to know only good. We can imagine evil blotted out. To deny its possibility is to be a Manichee. Do we go too far if we say that if evil *may be* blotted out, *may* cease to defile and to offend, *may* become a thing of the past, *it not only will but must?* We doubt that such a conclusion would be illogical arguing from the premises of this great proposition. Are not all God's attributes, his mercy, his holiness, his justice, his power, pledged to extirpate this evil which lies not beyond his grasp but within his power? *Our belief is that God must do this*—that it is a necessity of that nature of his which has its own binding eternal laws within itself. But we do not insist on this. Other minds may not see the necessity which rises up to our view. But is it not a wonderful recommendation to our view that it teaches that *God will do this, which we cannot deny that he can?* It tells us that hell is not the eternal abode of evil, concentrated in intensity, deepening and darkening in hue throughout eternity. It is not the everlasting exhibition of a scene with whose moral horrors all the sensuality and deviltry and hate and despair that has been exhibited in earth's foulest dens could not compare. The phrenzies of Bedlam, were earth one Bedlam: the despair of suicide, were each one of earth's sons and daughters to resolve on rushing from a hateful life: the hatred of the heart, were each heart to hate as Cain when he stood by Abel in the old field of murder, or the Dominican as he looked with demoniac hatred on the victim he was attending to the flames: could not exhibit even a feeble resem-

[1] John 8: 44.

blance to that which hell would present if Augustine's view were true. Thank God it is not true. God does not contemplate *this* hell. He will indeed gather into it all that offends—all the foul rakings of hate, and pride, and selfishness, and lust. But it is with the ominous purpose of Jehu, when he said "gather all the prophets of Baal and all his priests: let none be wanting," and "the house of Baal was full from one end to another." So will hell enlarge her borders, and the evil of the universe shall descend into it, and fill its wide domain, to be extirpated and blotted out forever.

When or how, or by whom the theory of eternal life in hell was introduced into the theology of the Christian Church, we will not here discuss. It is enough for us to know that, however ancient, it was no part of "the faith once delivered to the saints." We therefore reject it as a fable, a novelty, a monstrous doctrine, worthy of the Koran where it takes its fitting place, unworthy of the Gospel where it finds no place. We leave it to the disciple of Mohammed, lying on his couch of sensuality, to look down with cruel delight upon a scene of unutterable and endless misery.[1] This is not the consummation which the disciples of Christ or the worshipers of the Father of mercies are called on to rejoice in.[2] They could not look on it and rejoice: they could not regard pain as endless without feeling that unalloyed joy could never be their own. What they rejoice in is *the destruction* of the enemies of God, because in their destruction evil and misery are forever banished from God's world, and God reigns supreme in the affection and the loyalty of all that breathe.

From this stand-point we contemplate the final scene of retribution. There is heaven and there is hell. There is eternal life and there is eternal death. The redeemed enjoy the one: the lost are the subjects of the other. The Book of Revelation describes the latter—"Death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."[3] All that has been and continued to be evil: the fallen angels who now move in earth and air; the spirits who are kept in chains of darkness; the multitudes who have died without God and without hope; the multitudes whom the last day will find impenitent and unholy; have all been consigned to one common scene of punishment. According to their deserving is their chastisement. The time for each one's suffering over, he is wrapped in the slumber of eternal

[1] Koran 100: 88. [2] Ps. 68: 10. [3] Rev. 20: 14.

UMI

in lectures that ought to have been given to the world, that one of the foremost men of the present day gave expression to the thought that the origin of evil must ever remain above the comprehension of the finite mind. But this is an article of our Christian faith, that evil had an origin.[1] It is not from everlasting, else Manichæism were true and not a heresy. It is therefore no essential part of the constitution of the universe. It is not more essential to its future than to its past. If it must be *to* eternity it must have been *from* eternity. It is neither: it is a thing of time. We can imagine the ages to come to roll on ignorant of evil as were those past ages before the archangel fell. It may be that once more it will be the peculiar attribute of Godhead to know both good and evil: the blessedness of creation to know only good. We can imagine evil blotted out. To deny its possibility is to be a Manichee. Do we go too far if we say that if evil *may be* blotted out, *may* cease to defile and to offend, *may* become a thing of the past, *it not only will but must?* We doubt that such a conclusion would be illogical arguing from the premises of this great proposition. Are not all God's attributes, his mercy, his holiness, his justice, his power, pledged to extirpate this evil which lies not beyond his grasp but within his power? *Our belief is that God must do this*—that it is a necessity of that nature of his which has its own binding eternal laws within itself. But we do not insist on this. Other minds may not see the necessity which rises up to our view. But is it not a wonderful recommendation to our view that it teaches that *God will do this, which we cannot deny that he can?* It tells us that hell is not the eternal abode of evil, concentrated in intensity, deepening and darkening in hue throughout eternity. It is not the everlasting exhibition of a scene with whose moral horrors all the sensuality and deviltry and hate and despair that has been exhibited in earth's foulest dens could not compare. The phrenzies of Bedlam, were earth one Bedlam: the despair of suicide, were each one of earth's sons and daughters to resolve on rushing from a hateful life: the hatred of the heart, were each heart to hate as Cain when he stood by Abel in the old field of murder, or the Dominican as he looked with demoniac hatred on the victim he was attending to the flames: could not exhibit even a feeble resem-

[1] John 8: 44.

blance to that which hell would present if Augustine's view were true. Thank God it is not true. God does not contemplate *this* hell. He will indeed gather into it all that offends—all the foul rakings of hate, and pride, and selfishness, and lust. But it is with the ominous purpose of Jehu, when he said "gather all the prophets of Baal and all his priests: let none be wanting," and "the house of Baal was full from one end to another." So will hell enlarge her borders, and the evil of the universe shall descend into it, and fill its wide domain, to be extirpated and blotted out forever.

When or how, or by whom the theory of eternal life in hell was introduced into the theology of the Christian Church, we will not here discuss. It is enough for us to know that, however ancient, it was no part of "the faith once delivered to the saints." We therefore reject it as a fable, a novelty, a monstrous doctrine, worthy of the Koran where it takes its fitting place, unworthy of the Gospel where it finds no place. We leave it to the disciple of Mohammed, lying on his couch of sensuality, to look down with cruel delight upon a scene of unutterable and endless misery.[1] This is not the consummation which the disciples of Christ or the worshipers of the Father of mercies are called on to rejoice in.[2] They could not look on it and rejoice: they could not regard pain as endless without feeling that unalloyed joy could never be their own. What they rejoice in is *the destruction* of the enemies of God, because in their destruction evil and misery are forever banished from God's world, and God reigns supreme in the affection and the loyalty of all that breathe.

From this stand-point we contemplate the final scene of retribution. There is heaven and there is hell. There is eternal life and there is eternal death. The redeemed enjoy the one: the lost are the subjects of the other. The Book of Revelation describes the latter—"Death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."[3] All that has been and continued to be evil: the fallen angels who now move in earth and air; the spirits who are kept in chains of darkness; the multitudes who have died without God and without hope; the multitudes whom the last day will find impenitent and unholy; have all been consigned to one common scene of punishment. According to their deserving is their chastisement. The time for each one's suffering over, he is wrapped in the slumber of eternal

[1] Koran 100: 88. [2] Ps. 68: 10. [3] Rev. 20: 14.

UMI

death. Gradually life dies out in that fearful prison until unbroken silence reigns throughout it. They who would not find life have found death..... That lesson of awe is read and pondered on by all. Doubtless it will be a lesson of mercy to myriads of whom we know nought as yet. But it will be a lesson read without the shudder of anguish. The dead know not anything. They have drunk the waters of Lethe, and forgotten long ago their misery. There is no eternal antagonism of good and evil: no eternal jarring of the notes of praise and wailing. Evil has died out, and with it sorrow. Throughout God's world of life all is joy, and peace, and love.

THE SAINT'S JOY AND SORROW.

"I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you." (1 Cor. 4: 8.) "The days will come," &c. (Luke 17: 22.)

I place together these two verses—the words of the disciple and the words of the Master—as breathing the same spirit. They speak of present pressure and trouble; they point to a day of deliverance and triumph; they indicate the feelings of Christ's Church in this evil day and evil world. Paul means to say, "I wish the time of reigning were really come, as ye seem to think; for then should we share in that glory, instead of being the offscouring of all things;" as if feeling most deeply present trial, and longing for the day when the glory shall be revealed. The Lord means to say, "Days are coming when ye shall long even for *one* of the days of the Son of man; pointing to approaching tribulation, and intimating that under the pressure of this they would long for even one day's relief. Both these passages are written for us, that we might not be overwhelmed with despair as if some strange thing were happening to us, when trial comes down on us as a thick cloud. Taking both verses together, we extract from them such consolations and truths as the following, for the special use of the Church of God.

I. *The pressure of present evil.* There is evil in the world, and there will be till Christ comes. There is evil in the Church. There is sin, confusion, darkness, pain, affliction in many forms, bereavements, persecutions, anxieties, cares, and vexations, poverty, hatred, contempt, with many more such evils. They come on us daily. They press hard on us, and weigh us down. Each

disciple has his own special lot and peculiar trial. Paul felt his deeply; and we must all feel them, for we are not made insensible to sorrow by our becoming believers. The Head felt his sorrows, and prayed, Let this cup pass from me; so the body in all its members feels its sorrows, and "desires one of the days of the Son of man," or "desires to depart to be with Christ," or longs that the day of reigning were come, or wishes to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. "Oh! wretched man that I am," we cry, in reference to the inner conflict. "Wo is me that I dwell in Meshech," we cry concerning the fightings and storms without.

II. *The anticipation of coming good.* This good is called by our Lord the days of the Son of man, in contrast with the present days, which are simply days of man, or "man's day," "this present evil world." It is called by the apostle the time of reigning, in contrast with the present time of down-treading and persecution. These good days are coming, and we fix our hope upon them. They are blessed, and glorious, and endless. They shall reverse everything that is evil now—that pertaining to soul and body, to man and man's earth, to the Church and to the world. It is resurrection that we look for; the times of restitution; a kingdom; new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Then all shall be holy, happy, peaceful; the body glorified, the earth renewed, Satan bound, anti-Christ overthrown, sorrow turned into joy, the cross exchanged for the crown, the tents of Kedar for the New Jerusalem, the wilderness for Canaan, the weariness of the pilgrimage for the everlasting rest.

III. *The desire of relief.* Paul's words express this desire, and Christ's prediction intimates the same thing. We are not expected to be satisfied with pain and sorrow, so as not to long for their removal. We long for deliverance; nay, for the most temporary respite—even for *one* of the days of the Son of man. The burden is at times so heavy that we cry out under it, and wish that the present days were shortened, and the glory hastened. One day's respite would be a great thing for us when overwhelmed at times with evil. But the respite comes not; patience must have her perfect work. There is no sin in the desire, only let it not be impatient. "Not my will, but thine be done."

IV. *The frequent disappointment.* The sky seems for an hour to clear, and then the clouds return after the rain. The sunshine

death. Gradually life dies out in that fearful prison until unbroken silence reigns throughout it. They who would not find life have found death..... That lesson of awe is read and pondered on by all. Doubtless it will be a lesson of mercy to myriads of whom we know nought as yet. But it will be a lesson read without the shudder of anguish. The dead know not anything. They have drunk the waters of Lethe, and forgotten long ago their misery. There is no eternal antagonism of good and evil: no eternal jarring of the notes of praise and wailing. Evil has died out, and with it sorrow. Throughout God's world of life all is joy, and peace, and love.

THE SAINT'S JOY AND SORROW.

"I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you." (1 Cor. 4: 8.) "The days will come," &c. (Luke 17: 22.)

I place together these two verses—the words of the disciple and the words of the Master—as breathing the same spirit. They speak of present pressure and trouble; they point to a day of deliverance and triumph; they indicate the feelings of Christ's Church in this evil day and evil world. Paul means to say, "I wish the time of reigning were really come, as ye seem to think; for then should we share in that glory, instead of being the offscouring of all things;" as if feeling most deeply present trial, and longing for the day when the glory shall be revealed. The Lord means to say, "Days are coming when ye shall long even for *one* of the days of the Son of man; pointing to approaching tribulation, and intimating that under the pressure of this they would long for even one day's relief. Both these passages are written for us, that we might not be overwhelmed with despair as if some strange thing were happening to us, when trial comes down on us as a thick cloud. Taking both verses together, we extract from them such consolations and truths as the following, for the special use of the Church of God.

I. *The pressure of present evil.* There is evil in the world, and there will be till Christ comes. There is evil in the Church. There is sin, confusion, darkness, pain, affliction in many forms, bereavements, persecutions, anxieties, cares, and vexations, poverty, hatred, contempt, with many more such evils. They come on us daily. They press hard on us, and weigh us down. Each

disciple has his own special lot and peculiar trial. Paul felt his deeply; and we must all feel them, for we are not made insensible to sorrow by our becoming believers. The Head felt his sorrows, and prayed, Let this cup pass from me; so the body in all its members feels its sorrows, and "desires one of the days of the Son of man," or "desires to depart to be with Christ," or longs that the day of reigning were come, or wishes to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. "Oh! wretched man that I am," we cry, in reference to the inner conflict. "Wo is me that I dwell in Meshech," we cry concerning the fightings and storms without.

II. *The anticipation of coming good.* This good is called by our Lord the days of the Son of man, in contrast with the present days, which are simply days of man, or "man's day," "this present evil world." It is called by the apostle the time of reigning, in contrast with the present time of down-treading and persecution. These good days are coming, and we fix our hope upon them. They are blessed, and glorious, and endless. They shall reverse everything that is evil now—that pertaining to soul and body, to man and man's earth, to the Church and to the world. It is resurrection that we look for; the times of restitution; a kingdom; new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Then all shall be holy, happy, peaceful; the body glorified, the earth renewed, Satan bound, anti-Christ overthrown, sorrow turned into joy, the cross exchanged for the crown, the tents of Kedar for the New Jerusalem, the wilderness for Canaan, the weariness of the pilgrimage for the everlasting rest.

III. *The desire of relief.* Paul's words express this desire, and Christ's prediction intimates the same thing. We are not expected to be satisfied with pain and sorrow, so as not to long for their removal. We long for deliverance; nay, for the most temporary respite—even for *one* of the days of the Son of man. The burden is at times so heavy that we cry out under it, and wish that the present days were shortened, and the glory hastened. One day's respite would be a great thing for us when overwhelmed at times with evil. But the respite comes not; patience must have her perfect work. There is no sin in the desire, only let it not be impatient. "Not my will, but thine be done."

IV. *The frequent disappointment.* The sky seems for an hour to clear, and then the clouds return after the rain. The sunshine

promises and then passes away. We seem to come within sight of Canaan, and then another range of desert mountains rises up between. The day seems almost breaking, but it breaks not; the shadows seem just departing, but they depart not. Often we say, The long road is ending, the next turn will bring us to its termination; and then, instead, another long stretch of road lengthens out before us. Often we say, Surely this darkness cannot last, this evil must have spent itself; but in vain we thus think. The time is not yet. Often we say, Surely Christ is coming, the reign of crime is ending, the era of holy peace is at hand, the kingdom is going to begin; and then the prospect darkens again, and we seem to hear the voice, "Not yet, not yet." Often we cry, "How long?" and the answer is, "Wait," be patient, stablish your hearts; it will not be long.

V. *The kingdom at last.* These are sure things. They will come at last, though on the back of many disappointments. He that shall come will come, and will not tarry. The signs of the times have often cheated us, but at length they shall be found true. They will introduce the kingdom and the rest. The glory shall break forth; the Son of man shall be revealed; he who is our life shall appear. The ransomed of the Lord shall return with songs; the days of our mourning shall be ended; sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

VI. *The connection between present evil and future good.* Our present light affliction worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Present evil is the soil out of which the coming good is to spring. Light is sown for the righteous, but it is sown in darkness. It is out of sickness and weakness that our immortal health and strength are to come. The grave is the birthplace of incorruption. It is sown in weakness, and is raised in power. Thus God shall overcome evil with good; out of sin coming holiness, out of our brief sorrow the eternal joy.—*Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.*

Beware of a nominal acquiescence in certain alleged truths, because you have been taught them in your infancy, or because they are the established opinions of those with whom you are connected.... It is the part of a well-regulated mind not only to know the truths, but to know the grounds on which they are believed to be true.—*Abercrombie.*

THE USE AND VALUE OF THE TERM "AION."

By Thomas De Quincey.

The reason which gives to this word *aionian* what I do not scruple to call a *dreadful* importance, is the same reason, and no other, which prompted the dishonesty concerned in the ordinary interpretation of this word. The word happened to connect itself with the ancient dispute about the *duration* of future punishments. What was meant by the *aionian* punishments in the next world? Was the proper sense of the word *eternal*, or was it not? The popular argument may be stated thus: The ordinary construction of the term *aionian*, as equivalent to everlasting, cannot possibly be given up when associated with penal misery, because in that case, and by the very same act, the idea of eternity must be abandoned as applicable to the counter-bliss of Paradise. Torment and blessedness, it is argued, punishment and beatification stand upon the same level; the same word it was, the word *aionian*, which qualified the duration of either; and if eternity in the most rigorous acceptation fell away from the one idea it must equally fall away from the other. Well, be it so. But that would not settle the question. It might be very painful to renounce a long-cherished anticipation, but the necessity of doing so could not be received as a sufficient reason for adhering to the old unconditional use of the word. The argument is, that we must retain the old sense of *eternal*, because else we lose on one scale what we had gained upon the other.

Meantime all this speculation, first and last, is pure nonsense. *Aionian* does not mean *eternal*; neither does it mean of limited duration; nor would the unsettling of *aionian* in its old use, as applied to punishment, to torment, to misery, &c., carry with it any necessary unsettling of the idea in its application to the beatitudes of Paradise.

What then is an *aion?* In the use and acceptation of the Apocalypse, it is evidently this, viz: the duration or cycle of existence which belongs to any existence, not individually for itself, but universally in sight of its genus. Man, also, has a certain *aionian* life, possibly ranging somewhere about the period of 70 years assigned in Psalms. This period in such a case merely

UMI

promises and then passes away. We seem to come within sight of Canaan, and then another range of desert mountains rises up between. The day seems almost breaking, but it breaks not; the shadows seem just departing, but they depart not. Often we say, The long road is ending, the next turn will bring us to its termination; and then, instead, another long stretch of road lengthens out before us. Often we say, Surely this darkness cannot last, this evil must have spent itself; but in vain we thus think. The time is not yet. Often we say, Surely Christ is coming, the reign of crime is ending, the era of holy peace is at hand, the kingdom is going to begin; and then the prospect darkens again, and we seem to hear the voice, "Not yet, not yet." Often we cry, "How long?" and the answer is, "Wait," be patient, stablish your hearts; it will not be long.

V. *The kingdom at last.* These are sure things. They will come at last, though on the back of many disappointments. He that shall come will come, and will not tarry. The signs of the times have often cheated us, but at length they shall be found true. They will introduce the kingdom and the rest. The glory shall break forth; the Son of man shall be revealed; he who is our life shall appear. The ransomed of the Lord shall return with songs; the days of our mourning shall be ended; sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

VI. *The connection between present evil and future good.* Our present light affliction worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Present evil is the soil out of which the coming good is to spring. Light is sown for the righteous, but it is sown in darkness. It is out of sickness and weakness that our immortal health and strength are to come. The grave is the birthplace of incorruption. It is sown in weakness, and is raised in power. Thus God shall overcome evil with good; out of sin coming holiness, out of our brief sorrow the eternal joy.—*Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.*

Beware of a nominal acquiescence in certain alleged truths, because you have been taught them in your infancy, or because they are the established opinions of those with whom you are connected.... It is the part of a well-regulated mind not only to know the truths, but to know the grounds on which they are believed to be true.—*Abercrombie.*

THE USE AND VALUE OF THE TERM "AION."

By Thomas De Quincey.

The reason which gives to this word *aionian* what I do not scruple to call a *dreadful* importance, is the same reason, and no other, which prompted the dishonesty concerned in the ordinary interpretation of this word. The word happened to connect itself with the ancient dispute about the *duration* of future punishments. What was meant by the *aionian* punishments in the next world? Was the proper sense of the word *eternal*, or was it not? The popular argument may be stated thus: The ordinary construction of the term *aionian*, as equivalent to everlasting, cannot possibly be given up when associated with penal misery, because in that case, and by the very same act, the idea of eternity must be abandoned as applicable to the counter-bliss of Paradise. Torment and blessedness, it is argued, punishment and beatification stand upon the same level; the same word it was, the word *aionian*, which qualified the duration of either; and if eternity in the most rigorous acceptation fell away from the one idea it must equally fall away from the other. Well, be it so. But that would not settle the question. It might be very painful to renounce a long-cherished anticipation, but the necessity of doing so could not be received as a sufficient reason for adhering to the old unconditional use of the word. The argument is, that we must retain the old sense of *eternal*, because else we lose on one scale what we had gained upon the other.

Meantime all this speculation, first and last, is pure nonsense. *Aionian* does not mean *eternal*; neither does it mean of limited duration; nor would the unsettling of *aionian* in its old use, as applied to punishment, to torment, to misery, &c., carry with it any necessary unsettling of the idea in its application to the beatitudes of Paradise.

What then is an *aion?* In the use and acceptation of the Apocalypse, it is evidently this, viz: the duration or cycle of existence which belongs to any existence, not individually for itself, but universally in sight of its genus. Man, also, has a certain *aionian* life, possibly ranging somewhere about the period of 70 years assigned in Psalms. This period in such a case merely

UMI

represents the *aion* of an *individual*; but the *aion* of the RACE would probably amount to many millions of our earthly years; and it would remain an unfathomable mystery, deriving no light at all from the Septuagenarian *aion* of the individual; though between the two *aions* I have no doubt that some secret link of connection does and must subsist, however undiscoverable by human sagacity.

The crow, the deer, the eagle, &c., are all supposed to be long-lived. Some people have fancied that in their normal state they tended to a period of two centuries. I myself know nothing certain for or against this belief; but, supposing the case to be as represented, then this would be the *aionian* period of these animals, considered as individuals. Among trees, in like manner, the oak, the cedar, the yew, are notoriously of slow growth, and their *aionian* period is unusually long as regards the individual. What may be the *aion* of the whole species is entirely unknown. Amongst birds, one species at least has become extinct in our own generation; its *aion* was accomplished. So of all the fossil species in Zoology which Paleontology has revealed. Nothing, in short, throughout universal nature can for a moment be conceived to have been resigned to accident for its normal *aion*. All periods and dates of this order belong to the certainties of nature, but also at the same time to the mysteries of Providence. Throughout the Prophets, we are uniformly taught that nothing is more below the grandeur of Heaven than to assign earthly dates in fixing either the revolutions or the duration of great events such as prophecy would condescend to notice. A day has a prophetic meaning; but what sort of day? A mysterious expression for a time which has no resemblance to a natural day—sometimes comprehending long successions of centuries, and altering its meaning according to the object concerned. 'A time,' and 'times' or 'half a time,' 'an *aion*,' '*aions* of *aions*,' and other variations of this prophetic language are all significant.

Under the old and ordinary view of the Apocalyptic *aion*, which supposed it always to mean the same period of time—mysterious, indeed, and uncertain, as regards our knowledge, but fixed and rigorously certain in the secret counsels of God—it was presumed that this period, if it lost its character of infinity when applied to evil, to criminality, or to punishment, must lose it by a corresponding necessity equally when applied to happiness and the golden aspects of hope. But, on the contrary, ev-

ery object whatsoever, every mode of existence, has its own separate and independent *aion*. The most thoughtless person must be satisfied, on reflection, even apart from the express commentary furnished by the Apocalypse, that every life and mode of being must have hidden within itself the secret *why* of its duration. It is impossible to believe of *any* duration whatever, that it is determined capriciously. Always it rests upon some ground, ancient as light and darkness, though undiscoverable by man. This only is discoverable, as a general tendency, that the *aion*, or generic period of evil, *is constantly toward a fugitive duration*.

The *aion*, it is alleged, must always express the same idea, whatever *that* may be; if it is less than eternity for the evil cases, then it must be less for the good ones. Doubtless the idea of an *aion* is in one sense always uniform, always the same, viz: as a tenth or a twelfth is always the same. Arithmetic could not exist if any caprice or variation affected these ideas—a tenth is always more than an eleventh, always less than a ninth. But this uniformity of ratio and proportion does not hinder but that a tenth may now represent a guinea, and the next moment represent a thousand guineas. The exact amount of the duration expressed by an *aion* depends altogether upon the particular subject which yields the *aion*. It is, as I have said, a radix; and like an algebraic square-root or cube-root, though governed by the most rigorous laws of limitation, it must vary in obedience to the nature of the particular subject whose radix it forms. Meantime, as the summary of what I have written on this topic, accept these three propositions:

1. That man who allows himself to infer the eternity of evil from the counter-eternity of good builds upon the mistake of assigning a stationary and mechanic value to the idea of an *aion*; whereas the very purpose of Scripture in using this word was to evade such a value. The word is always varying for the very purpose of keeping it faithful to a spiritual identity. The period or duration of every object would be an essentially variable quantity were it not mysteriously commensurate to the inner nature of that object as laid open to the eyes of God. And thus it happens that everything in this world, possibly without a solitary exception, has its own separate *aion*: how many entities, so many *aions*.

2. But if it be an excess of blindness which can overlook the

represents the *aion* of an *individual*; but the *aion* of the RACE would probably amount to many millions of our earthly years; and it would remain an unfathomable mystery, deriving no light at all from the Septuagenarian *aion* of the individual; though between the two *aions* I have no doubt that some secret link of connection does and must subsist, however undiscoverable by human sagacity.

The crow, the deer, the eagle, &c., are all supposed to be long-lived. Some people have fancied that in their normal state they tended to a period of two centuries. I myself know nothing certain for or against this belief; but, supposing the case to be as represented, then this would be the *aionian* period of these animals, considered as individuals. Among trees, in like manner, the oak, the cedar, the yew, are notoriously of slow growth, and their *aionian* period is unusually long as regards the individual. What may be the *aion* of the whole species is entirely unknown. Amongst birds, one species at least has become extinct in our own generation; its *aion* was accomplished. So of all the fossil species in Zoology which Paleontology has revealed. Nothing, in short, throughout universal nature can for a moment be conceived to have been resigned to accident for its normal *aion*. All periods and dates of this order belong to the certainties of nature, but also at the same time to the mysteries of Providence. Throughout the Prophets, we are uniformly taught that nothing is more below the grandeur of Heaven than to assign earthly dates in fixing either the revolutions or the duration of great events such as prophecy would condescend to notice. A day has a prophetic meaning; but what sort of day? A mysterious expression for a time which has no resemblance to a natural day—sometimes comprehending long successions of centuries, and altering its meaning according to the object concerned. 'A time,' and 'times' or 'half a time,' 'an *aion*,' '*aions* of *aions*,' and other variations of this prophetic language are all significant.

Under the old and ordinary view of the Apocalyptic *aion*, which supposed it always to mean the same period of time—mysterious, indeed, and uncertain, as regards our knowledge, but fixed and rigorously certain in the secret counsels of God—it was presumed that this period, if it lost its character of infinity when applied to evil, to criminality, or to punishment, must lose it by a corresponding necessity equally when applied to happiness and the golden aspects of hope. But, on the contrary, ev-

ery object whatsoever, every mode of existence, has its own separate and independent *aion*. The most thoughtless person must be satisfied, on reflection, even apart from the express commentary furnished by the Apocalypse, that every life and mode of being must have hidden within itself the secret *why* of its duration. It is impossible to believe of *any* duration whatever, that it is determined capriciously. Always it rests upon some ground, ancient as light and darkness, though undiscoverable by man. This only is discoverable, as a general tendency, that the *aion*, or generic period of evil, *is constantly toward a fugitive duration*.

The *aion*, it is alleged, must always express the same idea, whatever *that* may be; if it is less than eternity for the evil cases, then it must be less for the good ones. Doubtless the idea of an *aion* is in one sense always uniform, always the same, viz: as a tenth or a twelfth is always the same. Arithmetic could not exist if any caprice or variation affected these ideas—a tenth is always more than an eleventh, always less than a ninth. But this uniformity of ratio and proportion does not hinder but that a tenth may now represent a guinea, and the next moment represent a thousand guineas. The exact amount of the duration expressed by an *aion* depends altogether upon the particular subject which yields the *aion*. It is, as I have said, a radix; and like an algebraic square-root or cube-root, though governed by the most rigorous laws of limitation, it must vary in obedience to the nature of the particular subject whose radix it forms. Meantime, as the summary of what I have written on this topic, accept these three propositions:

1. That man who allows himself to infer the eternity of evil from the counter-eternity of good builds upon the mistake of assigning a stationary and mechanic value to the idea of an *aion*; whereas the very purpose of Scripture in using this word was to evade such a value. The word is always varying for the very purpose of keeping it faithful to a spiritual identity. The period or duration of every object would be an essentially variable quantity were it not mysteriously commensurate to the inner nature of that object as laid open to the eyes of God. And thus it happens that everything in this world, possibly without a solitary exception, has its own separate *aion*: how many entities, so many *aions*.

2. But if it be an excess of blindness which can overlook the

aionian amongst even neutral entities, much deeper is that blindness which overlooks the separate tendencies of things evil and things good. *Naturally, all evil is fugitive and allied to death.*

3. I separately, speaking for myself only, profoundly believe that the Scriptures ascribe absolute and metaphysical eternity to one sole Being, viz: to God; and derivatively to all others according to the interest which they can plead in God's favor. Having anchorage in God, innumerable entities may possibly be admitted to a participation in the divine *aion.*

But what interest in the favor of God can belong to falsehood, to malignity, to impurity?

To invest *them* with *aionian* privileges is in effect, and by its results, to distrust and to insult the Deity. Evil would *not* be evil, if it had the power of self-subsistence, which is imputed to it in supposing its *aionian* life to be co-eternal with that which crowns and glorifies the good.—*Abridged by James H. Whitmore.*

THE RETURN OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND THE HOPE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

"For yet a little while, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." (Heb. 10: 37.)

While the wonder-stricken apostles were looking stedfastly toward heaven after their ascending Lord, two celestial messengers stood by them in white apparel, and addressed them in the following terms: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.) Henceforth the return of Jesus to this earth became the burden of the apostles' doctrine, and the hope and expectation of the early believers.

Judging from the purport of the bulk of the theological treatises and pulpit discourses of the present day, one would hardly expect that in the New Testament epistles, and the Revelation of John, the second coming is mentioned or alluded to not fewer than sixty-eight times. Yet such is the case.

It is not, however, from the frequency of reference, simply, to this grand event that its importance in the estimation of the apostles and the early believers appears, but also by the earnest and glowing language in which it is invariably mentioned. Thus

Paul, in his letter to the saints at Rome, indicates the intense desire of himself, and of those to whom he was writing, in the following stirring and graphic language: "I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us; for the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the sons of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, WHO HAVE THE FIRST-FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT, even *we* groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit: the redemption of our bodies." (Rom. 8: 18–23.) The same writer commences his letter to the church at Corinth by expressing his thankfulness to God on their account, because they came "behind in no gift, *waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" who, says he, "shall confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 1: 7, 8.)

It is to the same event the apostle refers in his letter to the faithful in Christ Jesus residing at Ephesus, when he speaks of "the day of redemption," "the redemption of the purchased possession." (Eph. 1: 14; 4: 30.)

Writing to the Philippians, he thus expresses his hope and theirs: "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. 3: 20, 21.)

In exhorting the brethren at Colosse to "mortify" the desires of the flesh, he employs this motive: "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." (Col. 3: 3–5.)

Referring, in his first letter to the Thessalonians, to the result of his preaching among them, he congratulates them that it was such as to lead them to "turn from dumb idols to serve the living God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." (1 Thess. 1: 9, 10.) And the object of his earnest prayer that "the Lord would make them to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men," was "to the end that he might stablish their hearts in holiness before God even the Father, at *the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all*

UMI

aionian amongst even neutral entities, much deeper is that blindness which overlooks the separate tendencies of things evil and things good. *Naturally, all evil is fugitive and allied to death.*

3. I separately, speaking for myself only, profoundly believe that the Scriptures ascribe absolute and metaphysical eternity to one sole Being, viz: to God; and derivatively to all others according to the interest which they can plead in God's favor. Having anchorage in God, innumerable entities may possibly be admitted to a participation in the divine *aion.*

But what interest in the favor of God can belong to falsehood, to malignity, to impurity?

To invest *them* with *aionian* privileges is in effect, and by its results, to distrust and to insult the Deity. Evil would *not* be evil, if it had the power of self-subsistence, which is imputed to it in supposing its *aionian* life to be co-eternal with that which crowns and glorifies the good.—*Abridged by James H. Whitmore.*

THE RETURN OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND THE HOPE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

"For yet a little while, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." (Heb. 10: 37.)

While the wonder-stricken apostles were looking stedfastly toward heaven after their ascending Lord, two celestial messengers stood by them in white apparel, and addressed them in the following terms: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.) Henceforth the return of Jesus to this earth became the burden of the apostles' doctrine, and the hope and expectation of the early believers.

Judging from the purport of the bulk of the theological treatises and pulpit discourses of the present day, one would hardly expect that in the New Testament epistles, and the Revelation of John, the second coming is mentioned or alluded to not fewer than sixty-eight times. Yet such is the case.

It is not, however, from the frequency of reference, simply, to this grand event that its importance in the estimation of the apostles and the early believers appears, but also by the earnest and glowing language in which it is invariably mentioned. Thus

Paul, in his letter to the saints at Rome, indicates the intense desire of himself, and of those to whom he was writing, in the following stirring and graphic language: "I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us; for the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the sons of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, WHO HAVE THE FIRST-FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT, even *we* groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit: the redemption of our bodies." (Rom. 8: 18–23.) The same writer commences his letter to the church at Corinth by expressing his thankfulness to God on their account, because they came "behind in no gift, *waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" who, says he, "shall confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 1: 7, 8.)

It is to the same event the apostle refers in his letter to the faithful in Christ Jesus residing at Ephesus, when he speaks of "the day of redemption," "the redemption of the purchased possession." (Eph. 1: 14; 4: 30.)

Writing to the Philippians, he thus expresses his hope and theirs: "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. 3: 20, 21.)

In exhorting the brethren at Colosse to "mortify" the desires of the flesh, he employs this motive: "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." (Col. 3: 3–5.)

Referring, in his first letter to the Thessalonians, to the result of his preaching among them, he congratulates them that it was such as to lead them to "turn from dumb idols to serve the living God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." (1 Thess. 1: 9, 10.) And the object of his earnest prayer that "the Lord would make them to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men," was "to the end that he might stablish their hearts in holiness before God even the Father, at *the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all*

UMI

his saints." (ch. 3: 12, 13.) And when, in the same letter, he administers consolation concerning those who had fallen asleep, the same event—the return of the Lord, and its concomitant results—are the burden of his theme. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others that have no hope; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so those also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent [that is, go before] those who are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 14–17.) To this gathering together of the resurrected and transformed saints to the Lord Jesus, Paul also refers in the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians, in these sublime and soul-stirring utterances: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [that is, we who are alive] shall be changed.... Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

The second letter to the Thessalonians opens with words of encouragement to believers under the severe tribulation they were called on to suffer for the truth's sake. It is a promise of "rest"—rest to the troubled—a rest which the righteous Lord would award to them "when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all those that believe." (2 Thess. 1: 7–10.)

When near the close of his career, we find the same apostle committing a solemn charge to Timothy, his own son in the faith, which he introduces and enforces in these terms: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word," etc. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight,

I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but to all them also that *love his appearing.*" (2 Tim. 4: 6, 7.) "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men," says the same writer in his letter to Titus, "hath appeared; teaching us that, denying ungodliness and wordly desires, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior, Jesus Christ." (Titus 2: 12, 13.) It is thus evident that the second appearing of the Lord Jesus was a subject of the greatest moment to the apostle Paul, and to the churches of the saints to which his letters are addressed.

The same fact characterizes the letters of the other apostles preserved to us in the New Testament. Hear James: "Be patient, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (James 5: 7, 8.) Hear Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto *salvation ready to be revealed* in the last time; wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, you are in heaviness through manifold trials; that the trial of your faith being much more precious than gold, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, *at the appearing of Jesus Christ.* Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought to you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" (1 Peter 1: 3–7, 13.)

Listen to John: "And now, little children, abide in him, that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed at his coming." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear [that is, it is not yet manifested] what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." (1 John 3: 28; 4: 2.)

his saints." (ch. 3: 12, 13.) And when, in the same letter, he administers consolation concerning those who had fallen asleep, the same event—the return of the Lord, and its concomitant results—are the burden of his theme. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others that have no hope; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so those also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent [that is, go before] those who are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 14–17.) To this gathering together of the resurrected and transformed saints to the Lord Jesus, Paul also refers in the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians, in these sublime and soul-stirring utterances: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [that is, we who are alive] shall be changed.... Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

The second letter to the Thessalonians opens with words of encouragement to believers under the severe tribulation they were called on to suffer for the truth's sake. It is a promise of "rest"—rest to the troubled—a rest which the righteous Lord would award to them "when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all those that believe." (2 Thess. 1: 7–10.)

When near the close of his career, we find the same apostle committing a solemn charge to Timothy, his own son in the faith, which he introduces and enforces in these terms: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word," etc. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight,

I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but to all them also that *love his appearing.*" (2 Tim. 4: 6, 7.) "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men," says the same writer in his letter to Titus, "hath appeared; teaching us that, denying ungodliness and wordly desires, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior, Jesus Christ." (Titus 2: 12, 13.) It is thus evident that the second appearing of the Lord Jesus was a subject of the greatest moment to the apostle Paul, and to the churches of the saints to which his letters are addressed.

The same fact characterizes the letters of the other apostles preserved to us in the New Testament. Hear James: "Be patient, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (James 5: 7, 8.) Hear Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto *salvation ready to be revealed* in the last time; wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, you are in heaviness through manifold trials; that the trial of your faith being much more precious than gold, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, *at the appearing of Jesus Christ.* Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought to you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" (1 Peter 1: 3–7, 13.)

Listen to John: "And now, little children, abide in him, that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed at his coming." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear [that is, it is not yet manifested] what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." (1 John 3: 28; 4: 2.)

Once more: Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, testifieth that "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," made the following prophetic announcement: "Behold, *the Lord cometh* with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14, 15.)

There is another fact in relation to the teaching of our blessed Lord and his apostles, and the faith and hope of the first believers, to which we would also call attention, namely: *that the appearing of the Lord Jesus, and the gathering together of the saints to himself, was an object not only of desire, but also of* CONSTANT EXPECTATION. This has appeared in some of those passages already quoted, and is clearly stated in many others, such as the following: "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light." (Rom. 13: 12, 13.) "You [Corinthians] come behind in no gift, *waiting* for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 1: 7.) "The Lord direct your hearts into the patient waiting for Christ." (2 Thess. 3: 5.) "Of the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write unto you, for you yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others, but let us watch and be sober." (1 Thess. 5: 2–6.) "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." (Phil. 4: 5.) "He that testifieth these things saith, Surely, I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus." (Rev. 22: 20.) The constant *waiting* and *watching* for the coming of the Lord was based on the fact *that they did not know how soon he might appear.* That they did expect his speedy appearing is manifest; but how soon it might be they knew not. The Lord Jesus himself said that he would come suddenly—like a flash of lightning—and that the *time* of his appearing was hid from men and angels, yea, even from himself. "Therefore," says he, "watch, for you know not at what hour your Lord doth come." (Matt. 24: 36–44; Mark 13: 32–37.)

There is one passage which is often cited against the idea we are now illustrating, namely: 2 Thess. 2: 1–12—"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in

mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand," &c.

One writer on the second coming of the Lord[1] avers that the apostle here "fearlessly crushes" the idea that "the day of Christ was at hand," and that no "pre-millennialist would employ the language of the apostle, as he would be afraid of destroying the possibility of watching." (pp. 42, 43.) Now, whatever be the meaning of the apostle's language here, it is a fact that he tells the Christians at Rome that "the day is at hand;" and, that this idea was not peculiar to him, but was taught also by the other New Testament writers, we have already had ample proof. Can it be that the apostle here seeks to "destroy" what he and his fellow-apostles commonly taught? No such thing. The mistake arises from a wrong translation of the Greek word rendered "at hand."

The term used in Rom. 13: 12 [*eggiken*] is, undoubtedly, correctly translated, "at hand." "And that knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is AT HAND: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light." The same word is frequently so rendered in the New Testament; but this is far from being the case with the term employed in 2 Thess. 2: 2 [*enesteken*]. It is never in any other instance rendered "at hand" by our translators; and in several instances they render it "present," in opposition to "future," or "coming." Observe its use in the following passages:

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things PRESENT, nor things to come, nor hight, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. 8: 38.)

"Therefore let no man glory in men, for all things are yours: whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or things PRESENT, or things to come; all are yours." (1 Cor. 3: 21, 22.)

"I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the PRESENT distress." (1 Cor. 7: 26.)

"Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this PRESENT evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." (Gal. 1: 4.)

"Which was a figure for the time then PRESENT, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did

[1] *Christ's Second Coming: Will It Be Pre-millennial?* By the Rev. David Brown, D. D. formerly of St. James' Free Church, Glasgow, now of Aberdeen, Scotland.

UMI

Once more: Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, testifieth that "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," made the following prophetic announcement: "Behold, *the Lord cometh* with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14, 15.)

There is another fact in relation to the teaching of our blessed Lord and his apostles, and the faith and hope of the first believers, to which we would also call attention, namely: *that the appearing of the Lord Jesus, and the gathering together of the saints to himself, was an object not only of desire, but also of* CONSTANT EXPECTATION. This has appeared in some of those passages already quoted, and is clearly stated in many others, such as the following: "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light." (Rom. 13: 12, 13.) "You [Corinthians] come behind in no gift, *waiting* for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 1: 7.) "The Lord direct your hearts into the patient waiting for Christ." (2 Thess. 3: 5.) "Of the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write unto you, for you yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others, but let us watch and be sober." (1 Thess. 5: 2–6.) "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." (Phil. 4: 5.) "He that testifieth these things saith, Surely, I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus." (Rev. 22: 20.) The constant *waiting* and *watching* for the coming of the Lord was based on the fact *that they did not know how soon he might appear.* That they did expect his speedy appearing is manifest; but how soon it might be they knew not. The Lord Jesus himself said that he would come suddenly—like a flash of lightning—and that the *time* of his appearing was hid from men and angels, yea, even from himself. "Therefore," says he, "watch, for you know not at what hour your Lord doth come." (Matt. 24: 36–44; Mark 13: 32–37.)

There is one passage which is often cited against the idea we are now illustrating, namely: 2 Thess. 2: 1–12—"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in

mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand," &c.

One writer on the second coming of the Lord[1] avers that the apostle here "fearlessly crushes" the idea that "the day of Christ was at hand," and that no "pre-millennialist would employ the language of the apostle, as he would be afraid of destroying the possibility of watching." (pp. 42, 43.) Now, whatever be the meaning of the apostle's language here, it is a fact that he tells the Christians at Rome that "the day is at hand;" and, that this idea was not peculiar to him, but was taught also by the other New Testament writers, we have already had ample proof. Can it be that the apostle here seeks to "destroy" what he and his fellow-apostles commonly taught? No such thing. The mistake arises from a wrong translation of the Greek word rendered "at hand."

The term used in Rom. 13: 12 [*eggiken*] is, undoubtedly, correctly translated, "at hand." "And that knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is AT HAND: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light." The same word is frequently so rendered in the New Testament; but this is far from being the case with the term employed in 2 Thess. 2: 2 [*enesteken*]. It is never in any other instance rendered "at hand" by our translators; and in several instances they render it "present," in opposition to "future," or "coming." Observe its use in the following passages:

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things PRESENT, nor things to come, nor hight, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. 8: 38.)

"Therefore let no man glory in men, for all things are yours: whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or things PRESENT, or things to come; all are yours." (1 Cor. 3: 21, 22.)

"I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the PRESENT distress." (1 Cor. 7: 26.)

"Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this PRESENT evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." (Gal. 1: 4.)

"Which was a figure for the time then PRESENT, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did

[1] *Christ's Second Coming: Will It Be Pre-millennial?* By the Rev. David Brown, D. D. formerly of St. James' Free Church, Glasgow, now of Aberdeen, Scotland.

UMI

the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." (Heb 9: 9.)

"Present," not "at hand," is evidently its meaning here. The sense of the passage, and the uniform testimony of the apostles, demand this. So rendered, the passage runs thus: "We beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of the Lord, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit or by letter as from us, that the day of Christ is present;" that is, already come.

It was not to crush their hopes, or allay their "feverish enthusiasm," regarding the speedy appearing of their glorified Redeemer, that the apostle wrote those words of caution, but contrariwise, to prevent their being "shaken in mind"—to quiet their fears that the day of the Lord was already present. Nothing short of the greatest misconception of the earnest desire, hope, and expectation of the early Christians could lead any one for a moment to imagine that the church of the Thessalonians had any reason to be "troubled" because the day of Christ was at hand: for was it not at "that day" that the holy apostle expected to receive from his Savior's hands "a crown of righteousness"—a crown that shall be awarded not to him alone, but to all those also who love that Savior's appearing?

But, on the other hand, the notion which some men appear to have been at pains to teach the brethren at Thessalonica—the notion that the day of Christ had already come, while the brethren who had fallen asleep had not awaked, but were slumbering still, and they themselves yet unchanged, and all things remained as formerly, afforded cause for their being troubled and shaken in mind—it is to remove this idea, or to prevent its being believed, that the apostle employs the language in question.

Viewed in the light of the context, this passage, so far from destroying the possibility of watching, is in perfect harmony with those other Scriptures we have cited; and from what has been advanced, it is trusted the reader will clearly perceive that THE SECOND APPEARING OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST WAS A MATTER OF INTENSE DESIRE, EARNEST HOPE, AND CONSTANT EXPECTATION TO THE APOSTLES, AND THE CHURCHES TO WHICH THE EPISTLES ARE ADDRESSED.

And so it was also regarded by the church down to the beginning of the fourth century. Justin Martyr, who lived within thirty years of the apostle John's death, testifies that in his time, the return of the Lord to reign on the earth was received by all true Christians, and denied by none but those who denied the resurrection. Says Madame Gasparin:

"The whole primitive church expected the coming of Christ, and believed in his temporal (*i. e.*, his personal) reign. This belief, so strong and firm in apostolic times, faded in proportion as faith lost its early simplicity. Men took to materializing precepts, and spiritualizing prophecy, and thus truth got modified on both sides."[1]

The late Dr. Chalmers, toward the close of his days, expressed the same hope and expectation:

"Above all, let us wait for the coming of the Son of man; and let my constant attitude be that of one who looketh for the Savior." Again, "Meanwhile let us wait for the coming of the Lord, who will destroy all adversaries, and will dissipate every darkening influence by the brightness of his appearance. I desire to cherish a more habitual and practical faith than heretofore in that coming which even the first Christians were called to hope for with all earnestness.... How much more we who are so much nearer to this great fulfillment than at the time when they believed!"[2]

And now, dear reader, permit the question, How stands it with you? Do you love the appearing of the Lord from heaven, and live in continual longing and expectation of his coming? If not, then you have not the hope of the early church, which is indeed "the hope of the gospel." For unless that same Jesus return from heaven to deliver us from death and the grave, and endow us with immortality,... there is no gospel of salvation, my dear friend, for you or me, or any son of Adam. Search the Scriptures, and see if it be not so. Was not the "kingdom of God" the grand theme of the preaching of Jesus and his apostles? And did not Jesus intimate that "this gospel of the kingdom should be preached in all the world?" And is not the record of this preaching in such terms as these: "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women?" How, then, can you have the "faith of the gospel as once delivered to the saints?" Unless you are con-

[1] *Near and Heavenly Horizons*, p. 266. [2] *Sabbath Scripture Readings*, vol. I., pp. 108-211.

UMI

the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." (Heb 9: 9.)

"Present," not "at hand," is evidently its meaning here. The sense of the passage, and the uniform testimony of the apostles, demand this. So rendered, the passage runs thus: "We beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of the Lord, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit or by letter as from us, that the day of Christ is present;" that is, already come.

It was not to crush their hopes, or allay their "feverish enthusiasm," regarding the speedy appearing of their glorified Redeemer, that the apostle wrote those words of caution, but contrariwise, to prevent their being "shaken in mind"—to quiet their fears that the day of the Lord was already present. Nothing short of the greatest misconception of the earnest desire, hope, and expectation of the early Christians could lead any one for a moment to imagine that the church of the Thessalonians had any reason to be "troubled" because the day of Christ was at hand: for was it not at "that day" that the holy apostle expected to receive from his Savior's hands "a crown of righteousness"—a crown that shall be awarded not to him alone, but to all those also who love that Savior's appearing?

But, on the other hand, the notion which some men appear to have been at pains to teach the brethren at Thessalonica—the notion that the day of Christ had already come, while the brethren who had fallen asleep had not awaked, but were slumbering still, and they themselves yet unchanged, and all things remained as formerly, afforded cause for their being troubled and shaken in mind—it is to remove this idea, or to prevent its being believed, that the apostle employs the language in question.

Viewed in the light of the context, this passage, so far from destroying the possibility of watching, is in perfect harmony with those other Scriptures we have cited; and from what has been advanced, it is trusted the reader will clearly perceive that THE SECOND APPEARING OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST WAS A MATTER OF INTENSE DESIRE, EARNEST HOPE, AND CONSTANT EXPECTATION TO THE APOSTLES, AND THE CHURCHES TO WHICH THE EPISTLES ARE ADDRESSED.

And so it was also regarded by the church down to the beginning of the fourth century. Justin Martyr, who lived within thirty years of the apostle John's death, testifies that in his time, the return of the Lord to reign on the earth was received by all true Christians, and denied by none but those who denied the resurrection. Says Madame Gasparin:

"The whole primitive church expected the coming of Christ, and believed in his temporal (*i. e.*, his personal) reign. This belief, so strong and firm in apostolic times, faded in proportion as faith lost its early simplicity. Men took to materializing precepts, and spiritualizing prophecy, and thus truth got modified on both sides."[1]

The late Dr. Chalmers, toward the close of his days, expressed the same hope and expectation:

"Above all, let us wait for the coming of the Son of man; and let my constant attitude be that of one who looketh for the Savior." Again, "Meanwhile let us wait for the coming of the Lord, who will destroy all adversaries, and will dissipate every darkening influence by the brightness of his appearance. I desire to cherish a more habitual and practical faith than heretofore in that coming which even the first Christians were called to hope for with all earnestness.... How much more we who are so much nearer to this great fulfillment than at the time when they believed!"[2]

And now, dear reader, permit the question, How stands it with you? Do you love the appearing of the Lord from heaven, and live in continual longing and expectation of his coming? If not, then you have not the hope of the early church, which is indeed "the hope of the gospel." For unless that same Jesus return from heaven to deliver us from death and the grave, and endow us with immortality,... there is no gospel of salvation, my dear friend, for you or me, or any son of Adam. Search the Scriptures, and see if it be not so. Was not the "kingdom of God" the grand theme of the preaching of Jesus and his apostles? And did not Jesus intimate that "this gospel of the kingdom should be preached in all the world?" And is not the record of this preaching in such terms as these: "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women?" How, then, can you have the "faith of the gospel as once delivered to the saints?" Unless you are con-

[1] *Near and Heavenly Horizons*, p. 266. [2] *Sabbath Scripture Readings*, vol. I., pp. 108-211.

UMI

vinced of the truth concerning the kingdom of God, as predicted by Moses and the prophets, and preached by Jesus and his apostles, how can you love the appearing of him who is Jehovah's Christ or Anointed for that kingdom? And if you love not his appearing, where is the ground of your confidence for acceptance with him? Ponder, I beseech you, these words: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and UNTO THEM THAT LOOK FOR HIM shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." (Heb. 9: 28.) Unto them that *look for* him, is the promise of salvation here given. Most assuredly, that same Jesus, who is gone into heaven, shall return to earth; and his return shall seal our eternal salvation or everlasting destruction. Either we shall be made like him, and see him as he is, or be smitten to death by the breath of his mouth; for "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe." (2 Thess. 1: 7–10.) "Be ye therefore ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh."—*Rainbow.*

"ASCENSION ROBES."

"A great multitude.... clothed with white robes." (Rev. 7: 9.)

Adventists have ever loved to dwell upon the passages from the Revelator's vivid pen where he describes the great company he saw in vision, wearing white robes, with palms of victory in their hands. To be one of that company is to attain all that God has promised to fallen man through our Savior.

> "We have heard of the robe, and the palm, and the crown,
> And the silvery band in white,"

and we love to talk and sing of them. And we not only love to talk of them, but we understand the imagery, and can talk of them understandingly.

In the palm, we see the emblem of victory, eternal victory over mortality and death. Long captives, we shall then see the power that has triumphed over the saints since Abel's fall, bound with his own fetters. After every other enemy, and all evil, has passed into the eternal oblivion of the second death, then, pierced with his own dart, "the last enemy shall be destroyed."

The crown we look for is a crown of life, of life eternal; for it fadeth not away. It will be given when the Chief Shepherd shall appear. (1 Pet. 5: 4.) It means a change from mortality to immortality. It means a body fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body, incapable of death.

And we look for "a robe," indeed, as Jesus has counseled us to do, that we "may be clothed, and the shame of our nakedness do not appear." (Rev. 3: 18.) This garment is described in Scripture phrase, as of "fine linen, clean and white, which [dropping the metaphor] *is the righteousness of saints.*" (Rev. 19: 8.) But right here we remember the prophet's words, that "all our righteousnesses are as *filthy rags.*" Surely this does not refer to the clean, white linen of the promised robe. No, this is the clothing of the sinner: it is of a piece with the righteousness attainable by the law; it is self-righteousness.

Paul tells us of a righteousness which may become ours by appropriation, and which is free to all. After setting forth his own righteousness, which afforded so much ground for confidence in the flesh, he says: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but *that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:* that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." (Phil. 3: 8–11.)

This is our expected robe. To none wearing this will it ever be said: "Friend, how camest thou in hither not having on a wedding garment?" That robe entitles the wearer to be caught up, or ascend to meet the Lord in the air, to enter through the gates into the city to the marriage of the Lamb, and so may, adopting the language of our assailants, very properly be called an "ASCENSION ROBE." Blessed is he that hath this robe of rare virtues; for all without it will be left on the outside when the

UMI

vinced of the truth concerning the kingdom of God, as predicted by Moses and the prophets, and preached by Jesus and his apostles, how can you love the appearing of him who is Jehovah's Christ or Anointed for that kingdom? And if you love not his appearing, where is the ground of your confidence for acceptance with him? Ponder, I beseech you, these words: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and UNTO THEM THAT LOOK FOR HIM shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." (Heb. 9: 28.) Unto them that *look for* him, is the promise of salvation here given. Most assuredly, that same Jesus, who is gone into heaven, shall return to earth; and his return shall seal our eternal salvation or everlasting destruction. Either we shall be made like him, and see him as he is, or be smitten to death by the breath of his mouth; for "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe." (2 Thess. 1: 7–10.) "Be ye therefore ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh."—*Rainbow.*

"ASCENSION ROBES."

"A great multitude.... clothed with white robes." (Rev. 7: 9.)

Adventists have ever loved to dwell upon the passages from the Revelator's vivid pen where he describes the great company he saw in vision, wearing white robes, with palms of victory in their hands. To be one of that company is to attain all that God has promised to fallen man through our Savior.

> "We have heard of the robe, and the palm, and the crown,
> And the silvery band in white,"

and we love to talk and sing of them. And we not only love to talk of them, but we understand the imagery, and can talk of them understandingly.

In the palm, we see the emblem of victory, eternal victory over mortality and death. Long captives, we shall then see the power that has triumphed over the saints since Abel's fall, bound with his own fetters. After every other enemy, and all evil, has passed into the eternal oblivion of the second death, then, pierced with his own dart, "the last enemy shall be destroyed."

The crown we look for is a crown of life, of life eternal; for it fadeth not away. It will be given when the Chief Shepherd shall appear. (1 Pet. 5: 4.) It means a change from mortality to immortality. It means a body fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body, incapable of death.

And we look for "a robe," indeed, as Jesus has counseled us to do, that we "may be clothed, and the shame of our nakedness do not appear." (Rev. 3: 18.) This garment is described in Scripture phrase, as of "fine linen, clean and white, which [dropping the metaphor] *is the righteousness of saints.*" (Rev. 19: 8.) But right here we remember the prophet's words, that "all our righteousnesses are as *filthy rags.*" Surely this does not refer to the clean, white linen of the promised robe. No, this is the clothing of the sinner: it is of a piece with the righteousness attainable by the law; it is self-righteousness.

Paul tells us of a righteousness which may become ours by appropriation, and which is free to all. After setting forth his own righteousness, which afforded so much ground for confidence in the flesh, he says: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but *that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:* that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." (Phil. 3: 8–11.)

This is our expected robe. To none wearing this will it ever be said: "Friend, how camest thou in hither not having on a wedding garment?" That robe entitles the wearer to be caught up, or ascend to meet the Lord in the air, to enter through the gates into the city to the marriage of the Lamb, and so may, adopting the language of our assailants, very properly be called an "ASCENSION ROBE." Blessed is he that hath this robe of rare virtues; for all without it will be left on the outside when the

UMI

door shall be shut, and mercy clean gone forever, to realize their loss, and, gnashing their teeth, with weeping and wailing, melt away, and be as though they had not been.

Upon the basis of the frequent expression of our hope to receive this robe, with palm and crown, our opponents, both in and out of the church, have constructed not a few scandals; and among the most senseless of these are those we may call the "ascension robe" stories. Doubtless it would be stooping for us to notice them in these pages, were it not for the fact that the falsehood has been put on enduring record, for the little while time may last, in works to which the public turn with confidence for correct information on the topics presented.

The New American Encyclopædia, published by the Appletons, of New York, and edited by Charles A. Dana and George Ripley, has given a character to this libel which will cause many to believe it true, spite of any testimony we could bring to the contrary. Yet, this authoritative and generally accurate work, and popular notions to the contrary notwithstanding, we challenge the proof *that any Adventist, ever, anywhere, under any circumstances, prepared an "ascension robe."*

It may be asked, What is an "ascension robe?" An "ascension robe" is, according to the tongue of scandal, a long white garment, sometimes simply a sheet wrapped around the body, in which it is said that Adventists have arrayed themselves from time to time, in the expectation that thus attired they would "go up" to meet Christ at his coming. Who originally told the falsehood, or set it afloat, it is now impossible to say. It was doubtless, as we have already intimated, suggested by the frequent references to the expected "robe" in our meetings; and was eagerly taken up by the religious and secular press, by the pulpit, and individuals, and circulated for the purpose of fostering and creating prejudice against us, in which it has largely succeeded. Indeed, such success has attended the circulation of slanders, misrepresentations, and exaggerations by opponents, aided by the blunders of some true, and the misconduct of some false brethren, that *prejudice* is now the greatest obstacle to the spread of our views.

But we remarked that *The New Encyclopædia* had indorsed this scandal, and recorded it as a historical fact. We will give its statement, found in vol. XI., p. 510:

"MILLER, WILLIAM. Founder of the sect of Millerites, or Second Adventists. Died in Low Hampton, N. Y., Dec. 20, 1849. ....His early facilities for education were slight, and he seems never to have been master of what are usually deemed the requisite resources for Biblical criticism. But in 1833 he began to lecture upon the speedy second coming of Christ, announcing in accordance with his interpretation of the prophecies that the earth was to be destroyed[1] in 1843. Even the day was specified, if not by himself, by some of his principal followers. His earnest and confident manner attracted attention; his Scriptural and historical argument seemed to many erudite and cogent, and after a few years of constant travel and preaching his disciples were reckoned at 30,000 to 50,000. They belonged not only to the United States, but to British America and Great Britain; and had a weekly organ, *The Advent Herald*, published in Boston, and still continued by the Rev. J. V. Himes. After the failure of the prediction in 1843, the interpretations of the leaders of the sect varied somewhat; but several different years and days were successively designated for the termination of all things; and in some localities the Millerites more than once attired themselves in white, and stationed themselves in graveyards and on the roofs of houses, waiting for the appearance of the Lord. The sect still exists, but with greatly diminished numbers, and holds that the second advent of Christ is near, without claiming to be certain of the precise date."

That nothing might be wanting to complete the injustice of this sketch, *the first part* of it was sent, in the proof-sheets, to *The Advent Herald* office in Boston, for correction as to dates and minor details. As it stood, it was as fair an account of the Advent movement as could be expected from those having no sympathy for it. But *the allusion to ascension robes was not in those proof-sheets;* it was added after the information asked for was received from *The Herald* office. What motives influenced the editors of that great work to publish a scandal calculated to create prejudice against us, without giving an opportunity for refutation, we will not undertake to define; certainly they were not of a very high order. And unfortunately for their credit for accuracy in dealing with an unpopular movement, they have contradicted themselves in their record of us. After stating, as quoted above, that the Adventists, once numbering from 30,000 to 50,000, "still exist, *but with greatly diminished numbers*," the editors of *The Encyclopædia*, in vol. XIV., p. 484, say: "They

[1] It is singular how our opponents will persist in ascribing to us the doctrine of the destruction of the earth, instead of its renewal. True, we teach its destruction as to its present conditions; but the burden of that thought, even, is that the destruction is only the first step in the process of cleansing and renewal.

door shall be shut, and mercy clean gone forever, to realize their loss, and, gnashing their teeth, with weeping and wailing, melt away, and be as though they had not been.

Upon the basis of the frequent expression of our hope to receive this robe, with palm and crown, our opponents, both in and out of the church, have constructed not a few scandals; and among the most senseless of these are those we may call the "ascension robe" stories. Doubtless it would be stooping for us to notice them in these pages, were it not for the fact that the falsehood has been put on enduring record, for the little while time may last, in works to which the public turn with confidence for correct information on the topics presented.

The New American Encyclopædia, published by the Appletons, of New York, and edited by Charles A. Dana and George Ripley, has given a character to this libel which will cause many to believe it true, spite of any testimony we could bring to the contrary. Yet, this authoritative and generally accurate work, and popular notions to the contrary notwithstanding, we challenge the proof *that any Adventist, ever, anywhere, under any circumstances, prepared an "ascension robe."*

It may be asked, What is an "ascension robe?" An "ascension robe" is, according to the tongue of scandal, a long white garment, sometimes simply a sheet wrapped around the body, in which it is said that Adventists have arrayed themselves from time to time, in the expectation that thus attired they would "go up" to meet Christ at his coming. Who originally told the falsehood, or set it afloat, it is now impossible to say. It was doubtless, as we have already intimated, suggested by the frequent references to the expected "robe" in our meetings; and was eagerly taken up by the religious and secular press, by the pulpit, and individuals, and circulated for the purpose of fostering and creating prejudice against us, in which it has largely succeeded. Indeed, such success has attended the circulation of slanders, misrepresentations, and exaggerations by opponents, aided by the blunders of some true, and the misconduct of some false brethren, that *prejudice* is now the greatest obstacle to the spread of our views.

But we remarked that *The New Encyclopædia* had indorsed this scandal, and recorded it as a historical fact. We will give its statement, found in vol. XI., p. 510:

"MILLER, WILLIAM. Founder of the sect of Millerites, or Second Adventists. Died in Low Hampton, N. Y., Dec. 20, 1849. ....His early facilities for education were slight, and he seems never to have been master of what are usually deemed the requisite resources for Biblical criticism. But in 1833 he began to lecture upon the speedy second coming of Christ, announcing in accordance with his interpretation of the prophecies that the earth was to be destroyed[1] in 1843. Even the day was specified, if not by himself, by some of his principal followers. His earnest and confident manner attracted attention; his Scriptural and historical argument seemed to many erudite and cogent, and after a few years of constant travel and preaching his disciples were reckoned at 30,000 to 50,000. They belonged not only to the United States, but to British America and Great Britain; and had a weekly organ, *The Advent Herald*, published in Boston, and still continued by the Rev. J. V. Himes. After the failure of the prediction in 1843, the interpretations of the leaders of the sect varied somewhat; but several different years and days were successively designated for the termination of all things; and in some localities the Millerites more than once attired themselves in white, and stationed themselves in graveyards and on the roofs of houses, waiting for the appearance of the Lord. The sect still exists, but with greatly diminished numbers, and holds that the second advent of Christ is near, without claiming to be certain of the precise date."

That nothing might be wanting to complete the injustice of this sketch, *the first part* of it was sent, in the proof-sheets, to *The Advent Herald* office in Boston, for correction as to dates and minor details. As it stood, it was as fair an account of the Advent movement as could be expected from those having no sympathy for it. But *the allusion to ascension robes was not in those proof-sheets;* it was added after the information asked for was received from *The Herald* office. What motives influenced the editors of that great work to publish a scandal calculated to create prejudice against us, without giving an opportunity for refutation, we will not undertake to define; certainly they were not of a very high order. And unfortunately for their credit for accuracy in dealing with an unpopular movement, they have contradicted themselves in their record of us. After stating, as quoted above, that the Adventists, once numbering from 30,000 to 50,000, "still exist, *but with greatly diminished numbers*," the editors of *The Encyclopædia*, in vol. XIV., p. 484, say: "They

[1] It is singular how our opponents will persist in ascribing to us the doctrine of the destruction of the earth, instead of its renewal. True, we teach its destruction as to its present conditions; but the burden of that thought, even, is that the destruction is only the first step in the process of cleansing and renewal.

have now four or five periodicals, and number near, or quite 160,000 members, in the United States, British America, and Great Britain." In one volume we have "greatly diminished" in numbers; in another our numbers are trebled!!

The attention of the publishers of *The Encyclopædia* was called to these errors years ago; but it still continues to bear false witness against us.

Another work which circulated this fiction, with others, of which it could not even be said that they were "founded on fact," was Belcher's *History of Religious Denominations.* We endeavored to procure a copy in order to quote its misstatements to our readers, but failed to do so. But while preparing this article, our attention was called to a work entitled *Christ Coming in His Kingdom—Millennarianism Refuted*, by one Wm. B. Orvis, like Mr. Belcher, a "Rev.," Mr. Orvis being a professed minister of the gospel among the Congregationalists; Mr. Belcher's denominational relations we do not recall.

Before quoting any of Mr. Orvis' allusions to Adventists, we will give an extract from his "parting word" to critics and readers. "We have," he says, "aimed to treat the subject and all who differ with us with *all possible* candor and charity, and hope to be so treated by readers and critics in return." How much of "candor and charity" it is "possible" for Mr. Orvis to exercise in dealing with an opponent, is illustrated in the following quotation (italics ours):

"HOW OFT' WILL ADVENTISTS BE ROBED FOR A BODILY ASCENSION?

"It would seem that after reacting a few times more, the grotesque scenes of the past few years would become repulsive scenes, in which thousands of adventists[1] looking for a materialized, and sense-observed coming of Christ, in the fogs of our atmosphere, have built their balloons (as at this hour they are said to be doing in the city of New York), and have enshrouded their bodies in their *ascension robes, as they termed them*,.... have gone out into the fields, and with bewildered gaze, and with frantic speech, song, and gesture, have thus waited for Christ to reappear, as they would look for an æronaut to descend from the clouds in his balloon. How oft, may we well ask, shall such farcical scenes be re-enacted?"

This is a paragraph worthy of that reliable historian of the

[1] It will be observed that Adventists is spelled with a small "a," which is supposed to be a withering expression of contempt.

times, "Q. K. Philander Doesticks," whose sketch of "the Millerites" was so widely published a few years ago. We think however that "Doesticks" is the more consistent of the two writers. Let us analyze Mr. Orvis' statements. 'THOUSANDS of Adventists have built their balloons'—what has become of them all? Where were they filled? out in "the fields?" If so, from what source? But beside this, 'they have enshrouded their bodies in their *ascension robes, as they termed them*, [!] gone into the fields, and *there* waited for Christ as men would watch for an æronaut to reappear.' Here they are in the fields, with their balloons, and attired in their "ascension robes," but instead of 'going up,' they remain in the fields, making no use whatever of their balloons. How much more dramatic, and *quite as near the truth*, to have pictured them as entering the balloons at the appointed hour, and, "enshrouded" in their robes, cutting loose from earth, "going up" with "frantic speech, and song, and gesture!" Mr. Orvis should learn to better preserve the unities of his fanciful delineations.

But, to be serious, we appeal to the candid reader, if the above quotation from a "Congregationalist minister" does not on its very face betray a deliberate determination to slander the Advent people. We cannot avoid the conviction that he knew he was uttering a false statement when he penned that paragraph—to say nothing of many other misstatements in his book—and sent it forth to the world. *The Christian Union* says that his book "has all the marks of insanity." We are inclined, for charity's sake, to adopt that view. Certainly we feel no sentiment but that of pity for this traducer of the people and cause we love.

But how can the tales of "ascension robes" be demonstrated to be false? We answer, *by pressing those who utter them for the proof.* We have heard many tell the story in public and in private, but never yet met the person who dared say that they, themselves, had seen an Adventist attired in an "ascension robe." When closely pressed they could only affirm, they "*had heard it on good authority.*" The manner in which the scandal-mongers deal out this ware from the budgets is well illustrated in the following letter from Br. A. Penfield, late of Washington, which was published in *The Advent Herald* some years since, as follows:

"I have been much interested in reading the *Notes of a Colporteur.* In his No. 11, he is confronted by an allegation that a certain young woman of the village made an ascension robe—cloth

have now four or five periodicals, and number near, or quite 160,000 members, in the United States, British America, and Great Britain." In one volume we have "greatly diminished" in numbers; in another our numbers are trebled!!

The attention of the publishers of *The Encyclopædia* was called to these errors years ago; but it still continues to bear false witness against us.

Another work which circulated this fiction, with others, of which it could not even be said that they were "founded on fact," was Belcher's *History of Religious Denominations.* We endeavored to procure a copy in order to quote its misstatements to our readers, but failed to do so. But while preparing this article, our attention was called to a work entitled *Christ Coming in His Kingdom—Millennarianism Refuted*, by one Wm. B. Orvis, like Mr. Belcher, a "Rev.," Mr. Orvis being a professed minister of the gospel among the Congregationalists; Mr. Belcher's denominational relations we do not recall.

Before quoting any of Mr. Orvis' allusions to Adventists, we will give an extract from his "parting word" to critics and readers. "We have," he says, "aimed to treat the subject and all who differ with us with *all possible* candor and charity, and hope to be so treated by readers and critics in return." How much of "candor and charity" it is "possible" for Mr. Orvis to exercise in dealing with an opponent, is illustrated in the following quotation (italics ours):

"HOW OFT' WILL ADVENTISTS BE ROBED FOR A BODILY ASCENSION?

"It would seem that after reacting a few times more, the grotesque scenes of the past few years would become repulsive scenes, in which thousands of adventists[1] looking for a materialized, and sense-observed coming of Christ, in the fogs of our atmosphere, have built their balloons (as at this hour they are said to be doing in the city of New York), and have enshrouded their bodies in their *ascension robes, as they termed them*,.... have gone out into the fields, and with bewildered gaze, and with frantic speech, song, and gesture, have thus waited for Christ to reappear, as they would look for an æronaut to descend from the clouds in his balloon. How oft, may we well ask, shall such farcical scenes be re-enacted?"

This is a paragraph worthy of that reliable historian of the

[1] It will be observed that Adventists is spelled with a small "a," which is supposed to be a withering expression of contempt.

times, "Q. K. Philander Doesticks," whose sketch of "the Millerites" was so widely published a few years ago. We think however that "Doesticks" is the more consistent of the two writers. Let us analyze Mr. Orvis' statements. 'THOUSANDS of Adventists have built their balloons'—what has become of them all? Where were they filled? out in "the fields?" If so, from what source? But beside this, 'they have enshrouded their bodies in their *ascension robes, as they termed them*, [!] gone into the fields, and *there* waited for Christ as men would watch for an æronaut to reappear.' Here they are in the fields, with their balloons, and attired in their "ascension robes," but instead of 'going up,' they remain in the fields, making no use whatever of their balloons. How much more dramatic, and *quite as near the truth*, to have pictured them as entering the balloons at the appointed hour, and, "enshrouded" in their robes, cutting loose from earth, "going up" with "frantic speech, and song, and gesture!" Mr. Orvis should learn to better preserve the unities of his fanciful delineations.

But, to be serious, we appeal to the candid reader, if the above quotation from a "Congregationalist minister" does not on its very face betray a deliberate determination to slander the Advent people. We cannot avoid the conviction that he knew he was uttering a false statement when he penned that paragraph—to say nothing of many other misstatements in his book—and sent it forth to the world. *The Christian Union* says that his book "has all the marks of insanity." We are inclined, for charity's sake, to adopt that view. Certainly we feel no sentiment but that of pity for this traducer of the people and cause we love.

But how can the tales of "ascension robes" be demonstrated to be false? We answer, *by pressing those who utter them for the proof.* We have heard many tell the story in public and in private, but never yet met the person who dared say that they, themselves, had seen an Adventist attired in an "ascension robe." When closely pressed they could only affirm, they "*had heard it on good authority.*" The manner in which the scandal-mongers deal out this ware from the budgets is well illustrated in the following letter from Br. A. Penfield, late of Washington, which was published in *The Advent Herald* some years since, as follows:

"I have been much interested in reading the *Notes of a Colporteur.* In his No. 11, he is confronted by an allegation that a certain young woman of the village made an ascension robe—cloth

bought at a certain store, &c. The Colporteur desired to go and see the young woman, who lived but a short distance, and offered $100 if two good witnesses would say that she ever made the robe; but the parties making the statement would not go. He then offered $100 a piece for every person proved to have made such a robe. This was declined. The Colporteur adds: 'I have found many lie-lovers on these things, and some of them in the pulpit.'

"Three or four years since, a Baptist minister of Cleveland being possessed of much 'popularity,' gave notice that he should preach on the subject of the Second Advent. A large part of the sermon was devoted to the consideration of ascension robes, etc., and a labored effort made to call forth a smile and a laugh. It was painful in the extreme to listen where there was no opportunity of replying. I however wrote him a letter, informing him that the walls of the same house, if they could speak, would testify with what intense solemnity listening crowds inside and out (the windows being opened) heard on the great subject in by-gone days. Though I did not offer money if he would prove that such robes had been made, I did say that till he furnished such proof I should consider him a tale-bearer. I never heard from him. Yet he baptized monthly after this in his congregation. How can such things be? I ask myself."

We once heard a Methodist minister in the town of Champlain, N. Y., in the course of a historical sketch of his society in that place, indulge this calumny. At the close of the sermon we challenged him as a Christian minister to either prove or retract his assertion. But he declined to do either the one or the other. Large pecuniary or other rewards have been offered, even by advertisement in the public papers—and many of these offers *are still standing*—for the proof that any Adventist ever wore an "ascension robe." But it cannot be proved; it is in the very nature of the case wholly impossible that it should be true.

We remember some three or four years since a Free Will Baptist preacher in New Hampshire issued a little pamphlet against us, filled with sneers, invective, and calumny, in which he revived the "ascension robe" story. We offered if he would prove that any Adventist, anywhere, ever prepared or wore an "ascension robe," we would furnish him, free of cost, 1,000 copies of his pamphlet for every instance established. And we now repeat, what we have said before, that *no Adventist, ever, anywhere, under any circumstances, prepared, or wore an "ascension robe."* Let the venders of this slur upon Adventism be pushed for the proof of their story; and if they decline or fail to furnish

it, and also refuse to retract, let them stand exposed as tale-bearers,[1] taking up a reproach against their neighbors,[2] speaking evil[3] against their brethren, who equally with them trust in Christ for salvation.

We do not deny that there has been fanaticism connected with the Advent movement; but if this condemns us, which of the sects that oppose us is to "cast the first stone?" and what becomes of Christianity itself! The apostles had to contend with fanatics; and so has every Christian reform since their day. This is a misfortune, not a crime.

To our Advent brethren we say, Let us not be ashamed of our hope! The white-robed throng of the Apocalyptic vision was composed of *tried* men and women. They had not only known reproach, but many of them had been called to suffer as we never may be. The saints of other ages had trials peculiar to their times. Ours are the last-day perils; not the prison, torture, sword, and flame; but association with those bearing the form of godliness, while denying its power: pleasure lovers: spiritual evils in high places. We cannot doubt that "the last days" are upon us; and if so, the time is near when the dead in Christ shall arise. *Then* we which are alive and remain shall be CAUGHT UP together with them to meet our Lord in the air. And blessed, indeed, they that shall then have already, prepared from the fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of the saints, AN "ASCENSION ROBE."

EDITORIAL.

We think our readers will enjoy the table we have set for them in this number of THE QUARTERLY; though we have had to depend more upon 'selections' than we wished to. Some of our brethren who promised us the aid of their pens in sustaining THE QUARTERLY have been so pressed with calls for labor in another department—preaching the Word—as to be unable to furnish the essays we expected from them. We are able, however, to promise articles in our next number from John Couch, Wm. Sheldon, Frank Burt, and James H. Whitmore, by whose help, with that of others who have made partial promises, we hope to make the closing number of our first volume the best and most interesting.

The article in the present number which will attract most attention is

[1] Lev. 19: 16. [2] Ps. 15: 3. [3] Titus 3: 2.

bought at a certain store, &c. The Colporteur desired to go and see the young woman, who lived but a short distance, and offered $100 if two good witnesses would say that she ever made the robe; but the parties making the statement would not go. He then offered $100 a piece for every person proved to have made such a robe. This was declined. The Colporteur adds: 'I have found many lie-lovers on these things, and some of them in the pulpit.'

"Three or four years since, a Baptist minister of Cleveland being possessed of much 'popularity,' gave notice that he should preach on the subject of the Second Advent. A large part of the sermon was devoted to the consideration of ascension robes, etc., and a labored effort made to call forth a smile and a laugh. It was painful in the extreme to listen where there was no opportunity of replying. I however wrote him a letter, informing him that the walls of the same house, if they could speak, would testify with what intense solemnity listening crowds inside and out (the windows being opened) heard on the great subject in by-gone days. Though I did not offer money if he would prove that such robes had been made, I did say that till he furnished such proof I should consider him a tale-bearer. I never heard from him. Yet he baptized monthly after this in his congregation. How can such things be? I ask myself."

We once heard a Methodist minister in the town of Champlain, N. Y., in the course of a historical sketch of his society in that place, indulge this calumny. At the close of the sermon we challenged him as a Christian minister to either prove or retract his assertion. But he declined to do either the one or the other. Large pecuniary or other rewards have been offered, even by advertisement in the public papers—and many of these offers *are still standing*—for the proof that any Adventist ever wore an "ascension robe." But it cannot be proved; it is in the very nature of the case wholly impossible that it should be true.

We remember some three or four years since a Free Will Baptist preacher in New Hampshire issued a little pamphlet against us, filled with sneers, invective, and calumny, in which he revived the "ascension robe" story. We offered if he would prove that any Adventist, anywhere, ever prepared or wore an "ascension robe," we would furnish him, free of cost, 1,000 copies of his pamphlet for every instance established. And we now repeat, what we have said before, that *no Adventist, ever, anywhere, under any circumstances, prepared, or wore an "ascension robe."* Let the venders of this slur upon Adventism be pushed for the proof of their story; and if they decline or fail to furnish

it, and also refuse to retract, let them stand exposed as tale-bearers,[1] taking up a reproach against their neighbors,[2] speaking evil[3] against their brethren, who equally with them trust in Christ for salvation.

We do not deny that there has been fanaticism connected with the Advent movement; but if this condemns us, which of the sects that oppose us is to "cast the first stone?" and what becomes of Christianity itself! The apostles had to contend with fanatics; and so has every Christian reform since their day. This is a misfortune, not a crime.

To our Advent brethren we say, Let us not be ashamed of our hope! The white-robed throng of the Apocalyptic vision was composed of *tried* men and women. They had not only known reproach, but many of them had been called to suffer as we never may be. The saints of other ages had trials peculiar to their times. Ours are the last-day perils; not the prison, torture, sword, and flame; but association with those bearing the form of godliness, while denying its power: pleasure lovers: spiritual evils in high places. We cannot doubt that "the last days" are upon us; and if so, the time is near when the dead in Christ shall arise. *Then* we which are alive and remain shall be CAUGHT UP together with them to meet our Lord in the air. And blessed, indeed, they that shall then have already, prepared from the fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of the saints, AN "ASCENSION ROBE."

EDITORIAL.

We think our readers will enjoy the table we have set for them in this number of THE QUARTERLY; though we have had to depend more upon 'selections' than we wished to. Some of our brethren who promised us the aid of their pens in sustaining THE QUARTERLY have been so pressed with calls for labor in another department—preaching the Word—as to be unable to furnish the essays we expected from them. We are able, however, to promise articles in our next number from John Couch, Wm. Sheldon, Frank Burt, and James H. Whitmore, by whose help, with that of others who have made partial promises, we hope to make the closing number of our first volume the best and most interesting.

The article in the present number which will attract most attention is

[1] Lev. 19: 16. [2] Ps. 15: 3. [3] Titus 3: 2.

that by Henry Constable, on future punishment. We commend it to the critical attention of all our readers. Mr. Constable has made his mark in Great Britain as a writer upon this topic, and we hope to have our pages still further enriched by his pen. The close reader will observe the point where he diverges from the view commonly held by Adventists; his position being quite identical with that of Prof. Hudson. But this does not weaken his scriptural argument—and the basis of his argument is purely scriptural—he has presented. His reasoning is a two-edged sword: it cuts down Universalism or Restorationism, while it demolishes the dreadful system elaborated by Augustine. It is so complete and conclusive a defence of the doctrine of the final extinction of sinners, and, indeed, of all evil, that we feel sure none will object to its length.

The rational and only scriptural theory of future punishment is gaining ground in Great Britain, and its advocates are greatly encouraged, though the reformation has not as yet acquired the proportions of a revolution in theological opinions. Still Mr. Constable is able to say in a recent private letter to us—"I think great progress is making in this country in overturning Augustine's theory of punishment; and my opinion is that in a few years it will cease to be generally held." We are sorry that we cannot express such a strong hope for theological reform in this country, though, indeed, our views are making considerable progress.

The view of man's nature taken by our English friends is not so radical as that held by the Adventists. English destructionists generally hold that the spirit survives the death of the body, the two being reunited in the resurrection, when man comes to judgment: and then, when the second death seizes the sinner, destroying soul and body in *gehenna*, he ceases to be.

This view does not trench so strongly upon theological prejudices as do our 'materialistic' ideas. *It lets men down easier:* but we doubt its strength and effectiveness, either for defense or attack, as compared with the Advent position. After examining all the arguments on this topic that have come under our observation, we fail to find evidence that man has even a *mortal* immaterial soul, or spirit, which as a conscious entity survives in death. To us the Bible represents the dead as without hope save in the resurrection: but we see not how this can possibly be true if there is a part of man, in which consciousness resides, that survives in death. This is called *materialism*. Be it so: we are not to be frightened by words. It is *Christian* materialism—it is *Bible* materialism. It has neither part nor lot with the infidelity of that school of philosophers with which our assailants strive to confound it, hoping thereby to bias the public mind against us. And, unfortunately for the truth's sake, they are quite successful in their efforts in this direction. But this difference in views does not abate our interest in our English brethren. We watch their progress against the tide of opposition, obloquy, and reproach, with the sympathy which can be felt by those only who have suffered the same things. We trust, in turn, that our differences will prove no bar to a return on their part of the interest and sympathy we profess.

"Father Miller," as Adventists call him, was no ordinary man. But as the generation who knew him personally are fast passing away, we desire to put on record a brief sketch of his life and character from a source which cannot, to say the least, be accused of a prejudice in his favor. We copy from *Littell's Living Age* an obituary notice, originally published in *The Boston Atlas*, in December, 1849, on the occasion of the old man's decease. It is an opponent's tribute of respect to a man greatly abused and maligned:

"Mr. Miller, of Low Hampton, N. Y., somewhat celebrated for his views respecting the nearness of the advent, died at his residence on Thursday, the 20th inst., in his 68th year.

"He was born at Pittsfield, in this State, February 15, 1782. When he was four years of age, his father removed to Low Hampton, Washington Co., N. Y. At the age of twenty-two, he settled in Poultney, Vt., and was a deputy sheriff for that county. On the commencement of the late war with Great Britain, he received a captain's commission in the U. S. army, where he remained till the peace. He took part in the action at Plattsburg, where 1,500 regulars, and about 4,000 volunteers, defeated the British, who were 15,000 strong. After the close of the war, he removed to the place of his late residence, where for several years he held the office of a justice of the peace.

"Mr. Miller was regarded with much affection by his neighbors, who esteemed him as a benevolent, intelligent man, and a kind neighbor. For many years he was a most assiduous student of history and the Scriptures, in the study of which he became impressed with a conviction that the fifth monarchy predicted by Daniel to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, under the whole heaven, for an everlasting possession (see Dan. 7), was about to be consummated. It becoming known that he entertained these views, he was importuned by many to write out his opinions, and afterwards to defend them in public. After refusing so to do for many years, he at length complied, and has been principally known to the public as a lecturer on prophecy. He thus describes his reluctance to appear in public, and the occasion of his first attempt:

"'One Saturday, after breakfast, in the summer of 1833, I sat down at my desk to examine some point, and as I arose to go out to work, it came home to me with more force than ever, "Go and tell it to the world." The impression was so sudden, and came with such force, that I settled down into my chair, saying, "I can't go, Lord." "Why not?" seemed to be the response; and then all my excuses came up, my want of ability, &c.; but my distress became so great, I entered into a solemn covenant with God, that if he would open the way, I would go and perform my duty to the world. "What do you mean by opening the way?" seemed to come to me. Why, said I, if I should have an invitation to speak publicly in any place, I will go and tell them what I find in the Bible about the Lord's coming. Instantly all my burden was gone, and I rejoiced that I should not probably be thus called upon, for I had never had such an invitation. My trials were not known, and I had but little expectation of being invited to any field of labor.

"'In about half an hour from this time, before I had left the room, a son of Mr. Guilford, of Dresden, about sixteen miles from my residence, came in and said that his father had sent for me, and wished me to go home with him. Supposing that he wished to see me on some business, I asked him what he wanted? He replied, that there was to be no preaching in their church the next day, and his father wished to have me come and talk to the people on the subject of the Lord's coming. I was immediately angry with myself for having made the covenant I had; I rebelled at once against the Lord, and determined not to go. I left the boy without giving him any answer, and retired in great distress to a grove near by. There I struggled with the Lord for about an hour, endeavoring to release myself from the covenant I had made with him, but I could get no relief. It was impressed

that by Henry Constable, on future punishment. We commend it to the critical attention of all our readers. Mr. Constable has made his mark in Great Britain as a writer upon this topic, and we hope to have our pages still further enriched by his pen. The close reader will observe the point where he diverges from the view commonly held by Adventists; his position being quite identical with that of Prof. Hudson. But this does not weaken his scriptural argument—and the basis of his argument is purely scriptural—he has presented. His reasoning is a two-edged sword: it cuts down Universalism or Restorationism, while it demolishes the dreadful system elaborated by Augustine. It is so complete and conclusive a defence of the doctrine of the final extinction of sinners, and, indeed, of all evil, that we feel sure none will object to its length.

The rational and only scriptural theory of future punishment is gaining ground in Great Britain, and its advocates are greatly encouraged, though the reformation has not as yet acquired the proportions of a revolution in theological opinions. Still Mr. Constable is able to say in a recent private letter to us—"I think great progress is making in this country in overturning Augustine's theory of punishment; and my opinion is that in a few years it will cease to be generally held." We are sorry that we cannot express such a strong hope for theological reform in this country, though, indeed, our views are making considerable progress.

The view of man's nature taken by our English friends is not so radical as that held by the Adventists. English destructionists generally hold that the spirit survives the death of the body, the two being reunited in the resurrection, when man comes to judgment: and then, when the second death seizes the sinner, destroying soul and body in *gehenna*, he ceases to be.

This view does not trench so strongly upon theological prejudices as do our 'materialistic' ideas. *It lets men down easier:* but we doubt its strength and effectiveness, either for defense or attack, as compared with the Advent position. After examining all the arguments on this topic that have come under our observation, we fail to find evidence that man has even a *mortal* immaterial soul, or spirit, which as a conscious entity survives in death. To us the Bible represents the dead as without hope save in the resurrection: but we see not how this can possibly be true if there is a part of man, in which consciousness resides, that survives in death. This is called *materialism*. Be it so: we are not to be frightened by words. It is *Christian* materialism—it is *Bible* materialism. It has neither part nor lot with the infidelity of that school of philosophers with which our assailants strive to confound it, hoping thereby to bias the public mind against us. And, unfortunately for the truth's sake, they are quite successful in their efforts in this direction. But this difference in views does not abate our interest in our English brethren. We watch their progress against the tide of opposition, obloquy, and reproach, with the sympathy which can be felt by those only who have suffered the same things. We trust, in turn, that our differences will prove no bar to a return on their part of the interest and sympathy we profess.

"Father Miller," as Adventists call him, was no ordinary man. But as the generation who knew him personally are fast passing away, we desire to put on record a brief sketch of his life and character from a source which cannot, to say the least, be accused of a prejudice in his favor. We copy from *Littell's Living Age* an obituary notice, originally published in *The Boston Atlas*, in December, 1849, on the occasion of the old man's decease. It is an opponent's tribute of respect to a man greatly abused and maligned:

"Mr. Miller, of Low Hampton, N. Y., somewhat celebrated for his views respecting the nearness of the advent, died at his residence on Thursday, the 20th inst., in his 68th year.

"He was born at Pittsfield, in this State, February 15, 1782. When he was four years of age, his father removed to Low Hampton, Washington Co., N. Y. At the age of twenty-two, he settled in Poultney, Vt., and was a deputy sheriff for that county. On the commencement of the late war with Great Britain, he received a captain's commission in the U. S. army, where he remained till the peace. He took part in the action at Plattsburg, where 1,500 regulars, and about 4,000 volunteers, defeated the British, who were 15,000 strong. After the close of the war, he removed to the place of his late residence, where for several years he held the office of a justice of the peace.

"Mr. Miller was regarded with much affection by his neighbors, who esteemed him as a benevolent, intelligent man, and a kind neighbor. For many years he was a most assiduous student of history and the Scriptures, in the study of which he became impressed with a conviction that the fifth monarchy predicted by Daniel to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, under the whole heaven, for an everlasting possession (see Dan. 7), was about to be consummated. It becoming known that he entertained these views, he was importuned by many to write out his opinions, and afterwards to defend them in public. After refusing so to do for many years, he at length complied, and has been principally known to the public as a lecturer on prophecy. He thus describes his reluctance to appear in public, and the occasion of his first attempt:

"'One Saturday, after breakfast, in the summer of 1833, I sat down at my desk to examine some point, and as I arose to go out to work, it came home to me with more force than ever, "Go and tell it to the world." The impression was so sudden, and came with such force, that I settled down into my chair, saying, "I can't go, Lord." "Why not?" seemed to be the response; and then all my excuses came up, my want of ability, &c.; but my distress became so great, I entered into a solemn covenant with God, that if he would open the way, I would go and perform my duty to the world. "What do you mean by opening the way?" seemed to come to me. Why, said I, if I should have an invitation to speak publicly in any place, I will go and tell them what I find in the Bible about the Lord's coming. Instantly all my burden was gone, and I rejoiced that I should not probably be thus called upon, for I had never had such an invitation. My trials were not known, and I had but little expectation of being invited to any field of labor.

"'In about half an hour from this time, before I had left the room, a son of Mr. Guilford, of Dresden, about sixteen miles from my residence, came in and said that his father had sent for me, and wished me to go home with him. Supposing that he wished to see me on some business, I asked him what he wanted? He replied, that there was to be no preaching in their church the next day, and his father wished to have me come and talk to the people on the subject of the Lord's coming. I was immediately angry with myself for having made the covenant I had; I rebelled at once against the Lord, and determined not to go. I left the boy without giving him any answer, and retired in great distress to a grove near by. There I struggled with the Lord for about an hour, endeavoring to release myself from the covenant I had made with him, but I could get no relief. It was impressed

that by Henry Constable, on future punishment. We commend it to the critical attention of all our readers. Mr. Constable has made his mark in Great Britain as a writer upon this topic, and we hope to have our pages still further enriched by his pen. The close reader will observe the point where he diverges from the view commonly held by Adventists; his position being quite identical with that of Prof. Hudson. But this does not weaken his scriptural argument—and the basis of his argument is purely scriptural—he has presented. His reasoning is a two-edged sword: it cuts down Universalism or Restorationism, while it demolishes the dreadful system elaborated by Augustine. It is so complete and conclusive a defence of the doctrine of the final extinction of sinners, and, indeed, of all evil, that we feel sure none will object to its length.

The rational and only scriptural theory of future punishment is gaining ground in Great Britain, and its advocates are greatly encouraged, though the reformation has not as yet acquired the proportions of a revolution in theological opinions. Still Mr. Constable is able to say in a recent private letter to us—"I think great progress is making in this country in overturning Augustine's theory of punishment; and my opinion is that in a few years it will cease to be generally held." We are sorry that we cannot express such a strong hope for theological reform in this country, though, indeed, our views are making considerable progress.

The view of man's nature taken by our English friends is not so radical as that held by the Adventists. English destructionists generally hold that the spirit survives the death of the body, the two being reunited in the resurrection, when man comes to judgment: and then, when the second death seizes the sinner, destroying soul and body in *gehenna*, he ceases to be.

This view does not trench so strongly upon theological prejudices as do our 'materialistic' ideas. *It lets men down easier:* but we doubt its strength and effectiveness, either for defense or attack, as compared with the Advent position. After examining all the arguments on this topic that have come under our observation, we fail to find evidence that man has even a *mortal* immaterial soul, or spirit, which as a conscious entity survives in death. To us the Bible represents the dead as without hope save in the resurrection: but we see not how this can possibly be true if there is a part of man, in which consciousness resides, that survives in death. This is called *materialism*. Be it so: we are not to be frightened by words. It is *Christian* materialism—it is *Bible* materialism. It has neither part nor lot with the infidelity of that school of philosophers with which our assailants strive to confound it, hoping thereby to bias the public mind against us. And, unfortunately for the truth's sake, they are quite successful in their efforts in this direction. But this difference in views does not abate our interest in our English brethren. We watch their progress against the tide of opposition, obloquy, and reproach, with the sympathy which can be felt by those only who have suffered the same things. We trust, in turn, that our differences will prove no bar to a return on their part of the interest and sympathy we profess.

"Father Miller," as Adventists call him, was no ordinary man. But as the generation who knew him personally are fast passing away, we desire to put on record a brief sketch of his life and character from a source which cannot, to say the least, be accused of a prejudice in his favor. We copy from *Littell's Living Age* an obituary notice, originally published in *The Boston Atlas*, in December, 1849, on the occasion of the old man's decease. It is an opponent's tribute of respect to a man greatly abused and maligned:

"Mr. Miller, of Low Hampton, N. Y., somewhat celebrated for his views respecting the nearness of the advent, died at his residence on Thursday, the 20th inst., in his 68th year.

"He was born at Pittsfield, in this State, February 15, 1782. When he was four years of age, his father removed to Low Hampton, Washington Co., N. Y. At the age of twenty-two, he settled in Poultney, Vt., and was a deputy sheriff for that county. On the commencement of the late war with Great Britain, he received a captain's commission in the U. S. army, where he remained till the peace. He took part in the action at Plattsburg, where 1,500 regulars, and about 4,000 volunteers, defeated the British, who were 15,000 strong. After the close of the war, he removed to the place of his late residence, where for several years he held the office of a justice of the peace.

"Mr. Miller was regarded with much affection by his neighbors, who esteemed him as a benevolent, intelligent man, and a kind neighbor. For many years he was a most assiduous student of history and the Scriptures, in the study of which he became impressed with a conviction that the fifth monarchy predicted by Daniel to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, under the whole heaven, for an everlasting possession (see Dan. 7), was about to be consummated. It becoming known that he entertained these views, he was importuned by many to write out his opinions, and afterwards to defend them in public. After refusing so to do for many years, he at length complied, and has been principally known to the public as a lecturer on prophecy. He thus describes his reluctance to appear in public, and the occasion of his first attempt:

"'One Saturday, after breakfast, in the summer of 1833, I sat down at my desk to examine some point, and as I arose to go out to work, it came home to me with more force than ever, "Go and tell it to the world." The impression was so sudden, and came with such force, that I settled down into my chair, saying, "I can't go, Lord." "Why not?" seemed to be the response; and then all my excuses came up, my want of ability, &c.; but my distress became so great, I entered into a solemn covenant with God, that if he would open the way, I would go and perform my duty to the world. "What do you mean by opening the way?" seemed to come to me. Why, said I, if I should have an invitation to speak publicly in any place, I will go and tell them what I find in the Bible about the Lord's coming. Instantly all my burden was gone, and I rejoiced that I should not probably be thus called upon, for I had never had such an invitation. My trials were not known, and I had but little expectation of being invited to any field of labor.

"'In about half an hour from this time, before I had left the room, a son of Mr. Guilford, of Dresden, about sixteen miles from my residence, came in and said that his father had sent for me, and wished me to go home with him. Supposing that he wished to see me on some business, I asked him what he wanted? He replied, that there was to be no preaching in their church the next day, and his father wished to have me come and talk to the people on the subject of the Lord's coming. I was immediately angry with myself for having made the covenant I had; I rebelled at once against the Lord, and determined not to go. I left the boy without giving him any answer, and retired in great distress to a grove near by. There I struggled with the Lord for about an hour, endeavoring to release myself from the covenant I had made with him, but I could get no relief. It was impressed

that by Henry Constable, on future punishment. We commend it to the critical attention of all our readers. Mr. Constable has made his mark in Great Britain as a writer upon this topic, and we hope to have our pages still further enriched by his pen. The close reader will observe the point where he diverges from the view commonly held by Adventists; his position being quite identical with that of Prof. Hudson. But this does not weaken his scriptural argument—and the basis of his argument is purely scriptural—he has presented. His reasoning is a two-edged sword: it cuts down Universalism or Restorationism, while it demolishes the dreadful system elaborated by Augustine. It is so complete and conclusive a defence of the doctrine of the final extinction of sinners, and, indeed, of all evil, that we feel sure none will object to its length.

The rational and only scriptural theory of future punishment is gaining ground in Great Britain, and its advocates are greatly encouraged, though the reformation has not as yet acquired the proportions of a revolution in theological opinions. Still Mr. Constable is able to say in a recent private letter to us—"I think great progress is making in this country in overturning Augustine's theory of punishment; and my opinion is that in a few years it will cease to be generally held." We are sorry that we cannot express such a strong hope for theological reform in this country, though, indeed, our views are making considerable progress.

The view of man's nature taken by our English friends is not so radical as that held by the Adventists. English destructionists generally hold that the spirit survives the death of the body, the two being reunited in the resurrection, when man comes to judgment: and then, when the second death seizes the sinner, destroying soul and body in *gehenna*, he ceases to be.

This view does not trench so strongly upon theological prejudices as do our 'materialistic' ideas. *It lets men down easier:* but we doubt its strength and effectiveness, either for defense or attack, as compared with the Advent position. After examining all the arguments on this topic that have come under our observation, we fail to find evidence that man has even a *mortal* immaterial soul, or spirit, which as a conscious entity survives in death. To us the Bible represents the dead as without hope save in the resurrection: but we see not how this can possibly be true if there is a part of man, in which consciousness resides, that survives in death. This is called *materialism*. Be it so: we are not to be frightened by words. It is *Christian* materialism—it is *Bible* materialism. It has neither part nor lot with the infidelity of that school of philosophers with which our assailants strive to confound it, hoping thereby to bias the public mind against us. And, unfortunately for the truth's sake, they are quite successful in their efforts in this direction. But this difference in views does not abate our interest in our English brethren. We watch their progress against the tide of opposition, obloquy, and reproach, with the sympathy which can be felt by those only who have suffered the same things. We trust, in turn, that our differences will prove no bar to a return on their part of the interest and sympathy we profess.

"Father Miller," as Adventists call him, was no ordinary man. But as the generation who knew him personally are fast passing away, we desire to put on record a brief sketch of his life and character from a source which cannot, to say the least, be accused of a prejudice in his favor. We copy from *Littell's Living Age* an obituary notice, originally published in *The Boston Atlas*, in December, 1849, on the occasion of the old man's decease. It is an opponent's tribute of respect to a man greatly abused and maligned:

"Mr. Miller, of Low Hampton, N. Y., somewhat celebrated for his views respecting the nearness of the advent, died at his residence on Thursday, the 20th inst., in his 68th year.

"He was born at Pittsfield, in this State, February 15, 1782. When he was four years of age, his father removed to Low Hampton, Washington Co., N. Y. At the age of twenty-two, he settled in Poultney, Vt., and was a deputy sheriff for that county. On the commencement of the late war with Great Britain, he received a captain's commission in the U. S. army, where he remained till the peace. He took part in the action at Plattsburg, where 1,500 regulars, and about 4,000 volunteers, defeated the British, who were 15,000 strong. After the close of the war, he removed to the place of his late residence, where for several years he held the office of a justice of the peace.

"Mr. Miller was regarded with much affection by his neighbors, who esteemed him as a benevolent, intelligent man, and a kind neighbor. For many years he was a most assiduous student of history and the Scriptures, in the study of which he became impressed with a conviction that the fifth monarchy predicted by Daniel to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, under the whole heaven, for an everlasting possession (see Dan. 7), was about to be consummated. It becoming known that he entertained these views, he was importuned by many to write out his opinions, and afterwards to defend them in public. After refusing so to do for many years, he at length complied, and has been principally known to the public as a lecturer on prophecy. He thus describes his reluctance to appear in public, and the occasion of his first attempt:

"'One Saturday, after breakfast, in the summer of 1833, I sat down at my desk to examine some point, and as I arose to go out to work, it came home to me with more force than ever, "Go and tell it to the world." The impression was so sudden, and came with such force, that I settled down into my chair, saying, "I can't go, Lord." "Why not?" seemed to be the response; and then all my excuses came up, my want of ability, &c.; but my distress became so great, I entered into a solemn covenant with God, that if he would open the way, I would go and perform my duty to the world. "What do you mean by opening the way?" seemed to come to me. Why, said I, if I should have an invitation to speak publicly in any place, I will go and tell them what I find in the Bible about the Lord's coming. Instantly all my burden was gone, and I rejoiced that I should not probably be thus called upon, for I had never had such an invitation. My trials were not known, and I had but little expectation of being invited to any field of labor.

"'In about half an hour from this time, before I had left the room, a son of Mr. Guilford, of Dresden, about sixteen miles from my residence, came in and said that his father had sent for me, and wished me to go home with him. Supposing that he wished to see me on some business, I asked him what he wanted? He replied, that there was to be no preaching in their church the next day, and his father wished to have me come and talk to the people on the subject of the Lord's coming. I was immediately angry with myself for having made the covenant I had; I rebelled at once against the Lord, and determined not to go. I left the boy without giving him any answer, and retired in great distress to a grove near by. There I struggled with the Lord for about an hour, endeavoring to release myself from the covenant I had made with him, but I could get no relief. It was impressed

upon my conscience, "Will you make a covenant with God, and break it so soon?" and the exceeding sinfulness of thus doing overwhelmed me. I finally submitted; and promised the Lord that if he would sustain me, I would go, trusting in him to give me grace and ability to perform all he should require of me. I returned to the house, and found the boy still waiting; he remained till after dinner, and I returned with him to Dresden.'

"From this time and onward he was pressed with invitations to present his views in many places, and traveled extensively throughout the Northern, Eastern, and Middle States, and Canada, and labored almost constantly for the succeeding twelve years; but visited no place without first receiving an urgent invitation.

"He was disappointed in the fulfillment of his expectations in 1843,* and came out the next year with an *Apology and Defence*, acknowledging the want of accuracy in his chronological calculations, but claiming that the nature and nearness of the event was still sustained by scriptural evidence. In that belief he has since lived and died—worn out with the infirmities of age.

"He was a man strictly temperate in all his habits, devoted in his family and social attachments, and proverbial for his integrity. His brain was of large volume, and he was capable of great mental efforts. He was naturally very amiable in his temperament; but when he thought he was unjustly represented, he often indulged in biting sarcasm on his revilers. His mental faculties were clear to the last, and he fell asleep joyful in the hope of a speedy resurrection."†

We could find no more choice words to fill out and close the present Quarterly than the following beautifully expressed thoughts, by the Editor of *The Rainbow*, concerning the present foretaste of our future perfect and eternal rest:

"Leaving entirely out of view for the moment all denominational peculiarities, and the different conclusions to which men have come respecting the future of the church and the world, it is refreshing to think of the glorious center of all divine life and hope—the Lord Jesus Christ. In him there is rest for the weary heart amidst the trials of the world, and the storms that agitate, and rend, and are likely at no distant day to overwhelm the nominal church. Happy is the man who has personal knowledge of this most blessed rest. He may be sorely tried in any or many of the manifold forms in which trials come; and, keenest pang of all! his loyalty to the Lord he loves, may be doubted, simply because that very loyalty has compelled him to reject as spurious certain notions that pass current in the churches as verities of divine revelation; but his refuge is certain, his place of shelter from the storm is sure, he comforts himself in the Lord, and leaves his cause with his God.

"And with relation to the great future, there is rest in Christ. Complicated, intervolved, mysterious as all things seem to be, the infinite wisdom of our blessed Redeemer will arrange and settle every thing so as to call forth the wonder and praise of the intelligent universe. All will yet be pronounced very good by One who cannot err, and the concurrent testimony of men and angels will echo the glorious declaration. It cannot, it will not be otherwise; let us therefore calmly, quietly, lovingly REST IN CHRIST."

* In all his published works he always stated the time as "about 1843."—*Ed. Atlas.*

† We heard "Father Miller" preach on this great subject, to an immense audience, one night in Philadelphia. His evident sincerity, earnestness, and simplicity attracted to him our high respect. We think the success which marked his labors, notwithstanding his want of learning even upon his chosen subject, arose from his bringing prominently forward a neglected truth. And it is to be feared that his confident and ill-founded predictions as to the time will throw temporary discredit upon the great burden of many prophecies—the second coming of our Lord.—*Ed. Liv. Age.*

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—APRIL, 1870.—NO. IV.

IMMATERIALISM; OR, SOUL-IMMORTALITY REFUTED.

By ELD. WM. SHELDON, Brodhead, Wis.

The Bible introduces the theme of immortality, and presents the matter in its true light; but instead of representing a part of man as already immortal, and destined to outlive the body, as a separate personality, it treats of "*mortal man*" (Job 4: 17), and never intimates that there are *two personalities* composing what we call man, the one the exact duplicate of the other, the one visible and the other invisible, the one mortal and the other immortal; but it treats of man as a *unit*, having a soul and spirit, but not in the sense of *personalities*. Neither the soul or spirit are ever pronounced immortal.

We will briefly examine all the statements of the Bible concerning immortality, and thus learn what its teachings are upon this topic.

1. "Now unto the King eternal, IMMORTAL, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." (1 Tim. 1: 17.)

Here the great truth is distinctly stated, that the supreme God is immortal. All believe this.

2. "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath IMMORTALITY, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." (1 Tim. 6: 16.)

In Rev. 19: 16 we read of the return of Christ from heaven, bearing this inscription, "King of kings, and Lord of lords;" and Paul speaks of him as now "dwelling in the light," and pre-

UMI

upon my conscience, "Will you make a covenant with God, and break it so soon?" and the exceeding sinfulness of thus doing overwhelmed me. I finally submitted; and promised the Lord that if he would sustain me, I would go, trusting in him to give me grace and ability to perform all he should require of me. I returned to the house, and found the boy still waiting; he remained till after dinner, and I returned with him to Dresden.'

"From this time and onward he was pressed with invitations to present his views in many places, and traveled extensively throughout the Northern, Eastern, and Middle States, and Canada, and labored almost constantly for the succeeding twelve years; but visited no place without first receiving an urgent invitation.

"He was disappointed in the fulfillment of his expectations in 1843,* and came out the next year with an *Apology and Defence*, acknowledging the want of accuracy in his chronological calculations, but claiming that the nature and nearness of the event was still sustained by scriptural evidence. In that belief he has since lived and died—worn out with the infirmities of age.

"He was a man strictly temperate in all his habits, devoted in his family and social attachments, and proverbial for his integrity. His brain was of large volume, and he was capable of great mental efforts. He was naturally very amiable in his temperament; but when he thought he was unjustly represented, he often indulged in biting sarcasm on his revilers. His mental faculties were clear to the last, and he fell asleep joyful in the hope of a speedy resurrection."†

We could find no more choice words to fill out and close the present Quarterly than the following beautifully expressed thoughts, by the Editor of *The Rainbow*, concerning the present foretaste of our future perfect and eternal rest:

"Leaving entirely out of view for the moment all denominational peculiarities, and the different conclusions to which men have come respecting the future of the church and the world, it is refreshing to think of the glorious center of all divine life and hope—the Lord Jesus Christ. In him there is rest for the weary heart amidst the trials of the world, and the storms that agitate, and rend, and are likely at no distant day to overwhelm the nominal church. Happy is the man who has personal knowledge of this most blessed rest. He may be sorely tried in any or many of the manifold forms in which trials come; and, keenest pang of all! his loyalty to the Lord he loves, may be doubted, simply because that very loyalty has compelled him to reject as spurious certain notions that pass current in the churches as verities of divine revelation; but his refuge is certain, his place of shelter from the storm is sure, he comforts himself in the Lord, and leaves his cause with his God.

"And with relation to the great future, there is rest in Christ. Complicated, intervolved, mysterious as all things seem to be, the infinite wisdom of our blessed Redeemer will arrange and settle every thing so as to call forth the wonder and praise of the intelligent universe. All will yet be pronounced very good by One who cannot err, and the concurrent testimony of men and angels will echo the glorious declaration. It cannot, it will not be otherwise; let us therefore calmly, quietly, lovingly REST IN CHRIST."

* In all his published works he always stated the time as "about 1843."—*Ed. Atlas.*

† We heard "Father Miller" preach on this great subject, to an immense audience, one night in Philadelphia. His evident sincerity, earnestness, and simplicity attracted to him our high respect. We think the success which marked his labors, notwithstanding his want of learning even upon his chosen subject, arose from his bringing prominently forward a neglected truth. And it is to be feared that his confident and ill-founded predictions as to the time will throw temporary discredit upon the great burden of many prophecies—the second coming of our Lord.—*Ed. Liv. Age.*

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—APRIL, 1870.—NO. IV.

IMMATERIALISM; OR, SOUL-IMMORTALITY REFUTED.

By ELD. WM. SHELDON, Brodhead, Wis.

The Bible introduces the theme of immortality, and presents the matter in its true light; but instead of representing a part of man as already immortal, and destined to outlive the body, as a separate personality, it treats of "*mortal man*" (Job 4: 17), and never intimates that there are *two personalities* composing what we call man, the one the exact duplicate of the other, the one visible and the other invisible, the one mortal and the other immortal; but it treats of man as a *unit*, having a soul and spirit, but not in the sense of *personalities*. Neither the soul or spirit are ever pronounced immortal.

We will briefly examine all the statements of the Bible concerning immortality, and thus learn what its teachings are upon this topic.

1. "Now unto the King eternal, IMMORTAL, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." (1 Tim. 1: 17.)

Here the great truth is distinctly stated, that the supreme God is immortal. All believe this.

2. "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath IMMORTALITY, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." (1 Tim. 6: 16.)

In Rev. 19: 16 we read of the return of Christ from heaven, bearing this inscription, "King of kings, and Lord of lords;" and Paul speaks of him as now "dwelling in the light," and pre-

UMI

sents him as the "ONLY" one from the human race who "*hath immortality*," or the only one from the ranks of men yet immortalized: "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more" (Rom. 6: 9): he is now immortal.

3. "Who [Christ] hath abolished death, and hath brought life and IMMORTALITY to light through the gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 10.)

Death was abolished in the person of Christ at his resurrection, and he bore away the keys; eternal life was then for the first time conferred on man—"the man Christ Jesus"—and immortality was then imparted, and exhibited in the resurrected person of Christ; for, says John, "the LIFE was *manifested*, and we have *seen* it, and bare witness, and show unto you that ETERNAL LIFE which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." (John 1: 2.) Though Christ was once possessed of a dying nature, and did die, he was not only released from the grasp of death, but was made *deathless*: "death hath *no more* dominion over him." (Rom. 6: 9.)

4. "Who [God] will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." (Rom. 2: 7.)

Here man is represented as destitute of immortality, and is told how he may availingly seek for it. God will render eternal life to the faithful seeker, at some future time, when mortality shall be succeeded by immortality; for while mortality may be the basis of a short life, nothing short of immortality can be the basis of endless life.

5. "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on *immortality*. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on *immortality*, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." (1 Cor. 15: 52–54.)

Here the term immortality occurs twice, and is applied to the condition of the saints at their resurrection. In no other text in the entire Bible can the term be found. This is just *what* the Bible says on this topic, and *all* it says. In brief, we are informed (1) that Jehovah is immortal; (2) that Christ is the only one yet immortalized from the ranks of mortals, and is now dwelling in the realm of light, to which mortal man never gained

access, and will in due time show himself in the capacity of the "*only Potentate*" due the world, in which capacity he has never been "seen" by mortal man; (3) that Christ not only abolished death in his own person, at his resurrection, but brought endless life, and an immortalized existence after death, to light, not theoretically, but practically, by exhibiting himself as the "*first-fruits*;" which fact is set forth "through the gospel;" (4) that man may "seek" for immortality by "well doing;" (5) that the righteous will receive immortality at the resurrection.

This is the unperverted theology of inspiration on this topic. Any conflicting theory, no matter how popular, is unreliable, speculative, and both *un*scriptural and *anti*-scriptural.

The prevailing sentiment among modern theologians, that the human soul or spirit is immortal, is without foundation in reason or scripture; and more than this, it clashes with both philosophy and revelation. Who can believe without *evidence?* and who can believe *contrary* to evidence? It is *weakness* to believe without evidence, and *rashness* to believe contrary to evidence. Where is the evidence that the soul is immortal? What prophet ever affirmed it? What apostle ever declared it? What inspired witness ever pronounces it immortal? Not one. The Bible uses the term soul 840 times without once pronouncing it immortal; and why is this? Man is represented as possessing both a *soul* and a *spirit*—two distinct things, and not two names for one thing: for we read of "the dividing asunder of soul and spirit" (Heb. 4: 12); and of "your whole spirit and soul and body" (2 Thess. 5: 23): so that the spirit is as really distinct from the soul as the soul is from the body; and the claim that the soul is a *personality* would also make the spirit a personality as really as the soul—thus locating two personalities within each man.

While we freely admit that the Bible often speaks concerning the soul *of* man, and the spirit *of* man, we deny that a *personality* is meant in a single case. Spirit *as* a personality (as in the case of God, angels, demons, and also when used as a synonym of man) is one thing; but the spirit OF a personality is a different thing altogether; for while God, *as a spirit*, is a personality, who would be wild enough to affirm that seven personalities are indicated by "the seven spirits OF God?" (Rev. 3: 1.) There is just as much authority for pronouncing the seven spirits *of* God seven distinct personal deities, as for pronouncing the

UMI

sents him as the "ONLY" one from the human race who "*hath immortality*," or the only one from the ranks of men yet immortalized: "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more" (Rom. 6: 9): he is now immortal.

3. "Who [Christ] hath abolished death, and hath brought life and IMMORTALITY to light through the gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 10.)

Death was abolished in the person of Christ at his resurrection, and he bore away the keys; eternal life was then for the first time conferred on man—"the man Christ Jesus"—and immortality was then imparted, and exhibited in the resurrected person of Christ; for, says John, "the LIFE was *manifested*, and we have *seen* it, and bare witness, and show unto you that ETERNAL LIFE which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." (John 1: 2.) Though Christ was once possessed of a dying nature, and did die, he was not only released from the grasp of death, but was made *deathless*: "death hath *no more* dominion over him." (Rom. 6: 9.)

4. "Who [God] will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." (Rom. 2: 7.)

Here man is represented as destitute of immortality, and is told how he may availingly seek for it. God will render eternal life to the faithful seeker, at some future time, when mortality shall be succeeded by immortality; for while mortality may be the basis of a short life, nothing short of immortality can be the basis of endless life.

5. "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on *immortality*. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on *immortality*, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." (1 Cor. 15: 52–54.)

Here the term immortality occurs twice, and is applied to the condition of the saints at their resurrection. In no other text in the entire Bible can the term be found. This is just *what* the Bible says on this topic, and *all* it says. In brief, we are informed (1) that Jehovah is immortal; (2) that Christ is the only one yet immortalized from the ranks of mortals, and is now dwelling in the realm of light, to which mortal man never gained

access, and will in due time show himself in the capacity of the "*only Potentate*" due the world, in which capacity he has never been "seen" by mortal man; (3) that Christ not only abolished death in his own person, at his resurrection, but brought endless life, and an immortalized existence after death, to light, not theoretically, but practically, by exhibiting himself as the "*first-fruits*;" which fact is set forth "through the gospel;" (4) that man may "seek" for immortality by "well doing;" (5) that the righteous will receive immortality at the resurrection.

This is the unperverted theology of inspiration on this topic. Any conflicting theory, no matter how popular, is unreliable, speculative, and both *un*scriptural and *anti*-scriptural.

The prevailing sentiment among modern theologians, that the human soul or spirit is immortal, is without foundation in reason or scripture; and more than this, it clashes with both philosophy and revelation. Who can believe without *evidence?* and who can believe *contrary* to evidence? It is *weakness* to believe without evidence, and *rashness* to believe contrary to evidence. Where is the evidence that the soul is immortal? What prophet ever affirmed it? What apostle ever declared it? What inspired witness ever pronounces it immortal? Not one. The Bible uses the term soul 840 times without once pronouncing it immortal; and why is this? Man is represented as possessing both a *soul* and a *spirit*—two distinct things, and not two names for one thing: for we read of "the dividing asunder of soul and spirit" (Heb. 4: 12); and of "your whole spirit and soul and body" (2 Thess. 5: 23): so that the spirit is as really distinct from the soul as the soul is from the body; and the claim that the soul is a *personality* would also make the spirit a personality as really as the soul—thus locating two personalities within each man.

While we freely admit that the Bible often speaks concerning the soul *of* man, and the spirit *of* man, we deny that a *personality* is meant in a single case. Spirit *as* a personality (as in the case of God, angels, demons, and also when used as a synonym of man) is one thing; but the spirit OF a personality is a different thing altogether; for while God, *as a spirit*, is a personality, who would be wild enough to affirm that seven personalities are indicated by "the seven spirits OF God?" (Rev. 3: 1.) There is just as much authority for pronouncing the seven spirits *of* God seven distinct personal deities, as for pronouncing the

UMI

spirit *of* man a personality distinct from man. If the "seven spirits *of* God" are so many influences or elements, instead of so many personalities, why insist, without proof, that the spirit OF man indicates an invisible personality within the body? This error arises from confounding spirit *as a being* with the spirit OF a being. Who does not know that the sun *as a light* is different from the light OF the sun? In the first case, reference is made to a *body*, and in the second case to something residing in or proceeding from the body.

So "soul" AS *a personality* is a different thing from the soul OF a personality. Let this point be understood, and it will save much needless confusion and speculation.

The term soul is often used as a synonym of "*life*," and "*mind*;" but neither life or mind are personalities. The Hebrew term *nephesh*, from which soul is translated in the Old Testament, is rendered *life* in the singular and plural form 120 times. The Greek term *psuche*, from which soul is translated in the New Testament, is rendered *life* 40 times in the singular and plural forms. Life is not a personality, but the principle within the personality that causes the personality to live.

The original word translated soul is sometimes rendered "*mind*;" but mind, instead of being a personality within man, is only a result of a living organism. Mind is feeble in infancy, which could not be the case if it were an immortal personality: as that which can be *increased* can also be *diminished*; and that which can be diminished in the *least degree* can be reduced to *non-existence* by the same principle, which cannot be true of immortality. Mind becomes childish in old age, or becomes impaired by disease, and is often deranged, and finally dies: "in that very day his *thoughts perish*." (Ps. 146: 4.) These philosophical and scriptural facts clearly negate the assumption that the mind is immortal, even if it were a personality; but this fact, with the fact that mind is not a personality, sweeps immortal-soulism into oblivion.

Life, not being a personality, cannot have a separate conscious existence, even though it is often called soul, as in Job 12: 10—"In whose hand *is* the *soul* of every *living thing*;" and in Prov. 12: 10—"A righteous man regardeth the life [*nephesh*, soul] of his beast." If life is a personality in man, it must also be in beasts.

Mind, not being a personality, could not have an independent

conscious existence, even if it were deathless; but add to this the fact that it *does die*, and the supposition of its immortality expires.

"*Soul*" is a term used not only in the foregoing senses, but also as a synonym of *person*, liable to die, and sleep in the grave, as in these texts:

"All they that go down to the dust, shall bow before him: and none can *keep alive* his own *soul*." (Ps. 22: 29.)
"Thou hast delivered my *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 56: 13.)
"He spared not their *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 78: 50.)
"Let my *soul live* and it shall praise thee." (Ps. 119: 175.)
"The eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him,....to deliver their *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 33: 19.)
"My *soul* chooseth strangling and *death* rather than my life." (Job 7: 15.)
"The *soul* that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18: 4.)
"Eight *souls* were saved by water." (1 Pet. 3: 20.)
"Every living *soul died* in the sea." (Rev. 16: 3.)
"What man is he that liveth and shall not see *death*? Shall he deliver his *soul* from the hand of the grave?" (Ps. 89: 48.)
"O Lord, thou hast brought up my *soul* from the *grave*." (Ps. 30: 3.)
"His *soul* draweth near unto the *grave*." (Job 33: 22.)
"He will deliver his *soul* from going into the pit." (Job 33: 28.)
"Thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered *it* from the pit of corruption." [Is. 38: 17.]
"God will redeem my *soul* from the power of the *grave*." [Ps. 49: 14.]
"Deliver my *soul* from the sword." [Ps. 22: 20.]
"They smote all the *souls* that were therein with the edge of the sword: utterly *destroying* them." [Josh. 11: 11.]

Many similar texts might be quoted in opposition to the doctrine of soul-immortality.

But I may be informed that man has a spirit which may be immortal, even if the soul is not. We fully believe that man has a spirit, but do not believe that it is a personality within him. Spirit AS *a personality* is different from the spirit OF a personality, as before shown. In Eccl. 3: 21 we read concerning "the spirit OF man," and also "the spirit OF the beast," and all this in the same text; and the original word *ruach* is used for spirit in both cases—"*ruach* OF man" and *ruach* OF the beast:" and more than this, it is affirmed of men and beasts in v. 19 of the same chapter, "They have all ONE *ruach*." The spirit of the one is as really an invisible being as the other. If "the spirit of the beast" is an element, the spirit of man cannot be a *personality*, as they have "ONE *ruach*"—one in *kind*. An element must be

UMI

spirit *of* man a personality distinct from man. If the "seven spirits *of* God" are so many influences or elements, instead of so many personalities, why insist, without proof, that the spirit OF man indicates an invisible personality within the body? This error arises from confounding spirit *as a being* with the spirit OF a being. Who does not know that the sun *as a light* is different from the light OF the sun? In the first case, reference is made to a *body*, and in the second case to something residing in or proceeding from the body.

So "soul" AS *a personality* is a different thing from the soul OF a personality. Let this point be understood, and it will save much needless confusion and speculation.

The term soul is often used as a synonym of "*life*," and "*mind*;" but neither life or mind are personalities. The Hebrew term *nephesh*, from which soul is translated in the Old Testament, is rendered *life* in the singular and plural form 120 times. The Greek term *psuche*, from which soul is translated in the New Testament, is rendered *life* 40 times in the singular and plural forms. Life is not a personality, but the principle within the personality that causes the personality to live.

The original word translated soul is sometimes rendered "*mind*;" but mind, instead of being a personality within man, is only a result of a living organism. Mind is feeble in infancy, which could not be the case if it were an immortal personality: as that which can be *increased* can also be *diminished*; and that which can be diminished in the *least degree* can be reduced to *non-existence* by the same principle, which cannot be true of immortality. Mind becomes childish in old age, or becomes impaired by disease, and is often deranged, and finally dies: "in that very day his *thoughts perish*." (Ps. 146: 4.) These philosophical and scriptural facts clearly negate the assumption that the mind is immortal, even if it were a personality; but this fact, with the fact that mind is not a personality, sweeps immortal-soulism into oblivion.

Life, not being a personality, cannot have a separate conscious existence, even though it is often called soul, as in Job 12: 10—"In whose hand *is* the *soul* of every *living thing*;" and in Prov. 12: 10—"A righteous man regardeth the life [*nephesh*, soul] of his beast." If life is a personality in man, it must also be in beasts.

Mind, not being a personality, could not have an independent

conscious existence, even if it were deathless; but add to this the fact that it *does die*, and the supposition of its immortality expires.

"*Soul*" is a term used not only in the foregoing senses, but also as a synonym of *person*, liable to die, and sleep in the grave, as in these texts:

"All they that go down to the dust, shall bow before him: and none can *keep alive* his own *soul*." (Ps. 22: 29.)
"Thou hast delivered my *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 56: 13.)
"He spared not their *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 78: 50.)
"Let my *soul live* and it shall praise thee." (Ps. 119: 175.)
"The eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him,....to deliver their *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 33: 19.)
"My *soul* chooseth strangling and *death* rather than my life." (Job 7: 15.)
"The *soul* that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18: 4.)
"Eight *souls* were saved by water." (1 Pet. 3: 20.)
"Every living *soul died* in the sea." (Rev. 16: 3.)
"What man is he that liveth and shall not see *death*? Shall he deliver his *soul* from the hand of the grave?" (Ps. 89: 48.)
"O Lord, thou hast brought up my *soul* from the *grave*." (Ps. 30: 3.)
"His *soul* draweth near unto the *grave*." (Job 33: 22.)
"He will deliver his *soul* from going into the pit." (Job 33: 28.)
"Thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered *it* from the pit of corruption." [Is. 38: 17.]
"God will redeem my *soul* from the power of the *grave*." [Ps. 49: 14.]
"Deliver my *soul* from the sword." [Ps. 22: 20.]
"They smote all the *souls* that were therein with the edge of the sword: utterly *destroying* them." [Josh. 11: 11.]

Many similar texts might be quoted in opposition to the doctrine of soul-immortality.

But I may be informed that man has a spirit which may be immortal, even if the soul is not. We fully believe that man has a spirit, but do not believe that it is a personality within him. Spirit AS *a personality* is different from the spirit OF a personality, as before shown. In Eccl. 3: 21 we read concerning "the spirit OF man," and also "the spirit OF the beast," and all this in the same text; and the original word *ruach* is used for spirit in both cases—"*ruach* OF man" and *ruach* OF the beast:" and more than this, it is affirmed of men and beasts in v. 19 of the same chapter, "They have all ONE *ruach*." The spirit of the one is as really an invisible being as the other. If "the spirit of the beast" is an element, the spirit of man cannot be a *personality*, as they have "ONE *ruach*"—one in *kind*. An element must be

UMI

intended in both cases, or an organized being in both cases. The latter conclusion would involve the existence of a world to come for ghosts of all sorts of animals. We read that "the spirit shall return to God who gave it (Eccl. 12 : 7); but did God give it as a *personality?* If so, it will return to God as a personality; but if it came from God as an *element*, it will return as an element. In the record of man's creation, we learn that after man was formed out of the dust of the ground, God "breathed into his nostrils *the breath of life*," or "the spirit of life"—not an entity, to distinguish him from the beasts, but something as really possessed by the animal creation as by man, in proof of which we read: "And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is *the breath of life* from under heaven." (Gen. 6 : 17.) "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is *the breath of life*." (Gen. 7 : 15.) "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils is *the breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land died." (Gen. 7 : 21, 22.)

Thus we learn (1) that the only spirit that is to return to God is the spirit that God "*gave*" man; (2) that the only spirit that God gave man at his creation was "the breath of life," or "spirit of life;" (3) that the animal creation also possess the "breath of life;" hence, to assume that it means an *entity*, instead of an *element*, in the case of man, is virtually to admit the same in the case of the animal creation. We have already seen that the mental spirit, or human mind, being a result of the physical organization, and not a super-added entity, lives and dies with the human organism. It is not a personality in men, God, nor angels.

We are often referred to texts that speak of "giving up the *ghost*," as though a *personal* ghost were meant—the very thing to be *proved*, instead of being *assumed*. That the giving up of the ghost is synonymous with *dying* is evident (1) from the fact that in the Old Testament, the original from which "gave up the ghost" is translated, is sometimes rendered "*died*," and by other equivalent words; (2) in the New Testament, *ghost* and *spirit* are both from the same original term; and we have already seen that the spirit *of* a man is not a personality, but a life-producing element, which man yields up in death; so "the body without

the spirit is dead." This is the only kind of ghost to be delivered up by man in death. A *personal* ghost is a creature of imagination.

We will now notice some of the many

EVIL RESULTS OF IMMORTAL-SOULISM.

As "a tree is known by its fruits," it may be well to examine the fruit of this great tree of theology; and if we find it bearing *evil* fruit, and *only* evil fruit, and also a *large quantity* of evil fruit, we shall be safe in pronouncing it an evil tree. Who will object to this conclusion? and who will object to the examination? Certainly no Christian, and no honest man *should* object for a moment. It will avail nothing to insist, previous to examination, that it is a good tree, simply because some honest but mistaken friends have long pronounced it good, which friends also agree with us that certain fruit is evil, ignoring the fact that the very fruit which they pronounce evil grows on the very tree which they call good and grows on no other tree in the wide world. We read of "twelve manner of fruits" on the tree of life—all good fruits, too—but this tree of immortal-soulism yields a larger variety; more than twelve kinds; but each variety is bitter and evil. It must be obvious to every unbiased person that a tree yielding such a *quantity* of evil fruit, and also such a *variety* of evil fruit, cannot be a good tree. Let us, then, enter into an examination, not for the purpose of learning whether certain species of theological fruit is really evil, or not, but to determine whether this fruit, which we all agree in pronouncing evil, really grows on this tree of immortal-soulism, and whether this fruit could ever have existed provided this *tree* had never been in existence.

I. *Catholicism* is one of the fruits of this tree.

1. No one would ever be so foolish as to pray to the Virgin Mary in heaven, unless first led to believe that she is alive in some sense after passing through the terrors of death; and knowing that her body is dead, they have *assumed*, without proof, and contrary to facts, that her soul was immortal, and soared to heaven. If it is true that the Virgin is alive, and in heaven, why not petition her to intercede with the Redeemer for us? Who can reasonably object? In this world we ask the saints of God to pray for us, and if those saints really live after death, and go to heaven where God is, and live in his immediate

UMI

intended in both cases, or an organized being in both cases. The latter conclusion would involve the existence of a world to come for ghosts of all sorts of animals. We read that "the spirit shall return to God who gave it (Eccl. 12 : 7); but did God give it as a *personality?* If so, it will return to God as a personality; but if it came from God as an *element*, it will return as an element. In the record of man's creation, we learn that after man was formed out of the dust of the ground, God "breathed into his nostrils *the breath of life*," or "the spirit of life"—not an entity, to distinguish him from the beasts, but something as really possessed by the animal creation as by man, in proof of which we read: "And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is *the breath of life* from under heaven." (Gen. 6 : 17.) "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is *the breath of life*." (Gen. 7 : 15.) "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils is *the breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land died." (Gen. 7 : 21, 22.)

Thus we learn (1) that the only spirit that is to return to God is the spirit that God "*gave*" man; (2) that the only spirit that God gave man at his creation was "the breath of life," or "spirit of life;" (3) that the animal creation also possess the "breath of life;" hence, to assume that it means an *entity*, instead of an *element*, in the case of man, is virtually to admit the same in the case of the animal creation. We have already seen that the mental spirit, or human mind, being a result of the physical organization, and not a super-added entity, lives and dies with the human organism. It is not a personality in men, God, nor angels.

We are often referred to texts that speak of "giving up the *ghost*," as though a *personal* ghost were meant—the very thing to be *proved*, instead of being *assumed*. That the giving up of the ghost is synonymous with *dying* is evident (1) from the fact that in the Old Testament, the original from which "gave up the ghost" is translated, is sometimes rendered "*died*," and by other equivalent words; (2) in the New Testament, *ghost* and *spirit* are both from the same original term; and we have already seen that the spirit *of* a man is not a personality, but a life-producing element, which man yields up in death; so "the body without

the spirit is dead." This is the only kind of ghost to be delivered up by man in death. A *personal* ghost is a creature of imagination.

We will now notice some of the many

EVIL RESULTS OF IMMORTAL-SOULISM.

As "a tree is known by its fruits," it may be well to examine the fruit of this great tree of theology; and if we find it bearing *evil* fruit, and *only* evil fruit, and also a *large quantity* of evil fruit, we shall be safe in pronouncing it an evil tree. Who will object to this conclusion? and who will object to the examination? Certainly no Christian, and no honest man *should* object for a moment. It will avail nothing to insist, previous to examination, that it is a good tree, simply because some honest but mistaken friends have long pronounced it good, which friends also agree with us that certain fruit is evil, ignoring the fact that the very fruit which they pronounce evil grows on the very tree which they call good and grows on no other tree in the wide world. We read of "twelve manner of fruits" on the tree of life—all good fruits, too—but this tree of immortal-soulism yields a larger variety; more than twelve kinds; but each variety is bitter and evil. It must be obvious to every unbiased person that a tree yielding such a *quantity* of evil fruit, and also such a *variety* of evil fruit, cannot be a good tree. Let us, then, enter into an examination, not for the purpose of learning whether certain species of theological fruit is really evil, or not, but to determine whether this fruit, which we all agree in pronouncing evil, really grows on this tree of immortal-soulism, and whether this fruit could ever have existed provided this *tree* had never been in existence.

I. *Catholicism* is one of the fruits of this tree.

1. No one would ever be so foolish as to pray to the Virgin Mary in heaven, unless first led to believe that she is alive in some sense after passing through the terrors of death; and knowing that her body is dead, they have *assumed*, without proof, and contrary to facts, that her soul was immortal, and soared to heaven. If it is true that the Virgin is alive, and in heaven, why not petition her to intercede with the Redeemer for us? Who can reasonably object? In this world we ask the saints of God to pray for us, and if those saints really live after death, and go to heaven where God is, and live in his immediate

UMI

presence, where they cannot regard iniquity in their hearts to prevent their prayers from being heard, it would be perfectly proper to petition them to pray to God for us. Let not Protestants denounce this practice while claiming that the Virgin is alive: for such Protestants are more inconsistent than the Catholics. They insist that the tree which yields the fruit is good, but pronounce the fruit evil; while the Catholics say that both the tree and the fruit, in this instance, is good; though even Catholics themselves, in other cases, are compelled to pronounce some of the fruits of this tree evil.

But we pronounce both the tree and its fruits evil. *We* do not pray to the Virgin in heaven, because she is not there, but in the grave. We do not importune her to pray for us, because she is dead and cannot pray. Teach Catholics that Mary is dead, and they would pray to *God*, rather than to a dead virgin. Teach them the Bible doctrine, that the heaven to be enjoyed by the Virgin Mary, and all the other saints, is on the other side of the resurrection and judgment, and that Mary *herself*, instead of a ghostly shade, will be there, and that all the saints will be there as glorified personalities, and not as mere shadows, dressed in garments of moonshine; then they will desist from the practice of praying to an imaginary female ghost. But let not folly rebuke foolishness—let not Protestants, who claim that Mary has turned into a personal ghost, rebuke Catholics for praying to such a being.

2. No one would ever be foolish enough to pay the priest the last dollar to pray the ghost of a deceased friend out of purgatory, were it not for immortal-soulism. This fruit grows only on that tree. Let the fact be understood that death kills the entire man, and that he must remain dead till the resurrection, and that no *entity* or *personality* leaves man at death, but simply an *element* called the *spirit of life* returns to God who gave it, and Catholicism, with its ghostly purgatory, would become obsolete.

II. *Mohammedanism* is another fruit that grows on the tree of immortal-soulism.

1. Just establish the Scriptural fact in the minds of all men that death *kills* men, instead of subtracting ghostly entities, or spirit personalities, from them, to inhabit some other world, and no one could ever have been deceived by Mahomet's story of riding on a ghostly horse, from earth up through seven ghost-heavens, where he saw and conversed with Noah, Abraham,

Adam, and others. But instead of being deluded by this theological nonsense, they could have met him with the claim, these men are dead, and not alive; and in their graves instead of being in heaven.

2. Mahomet taught his soldiers that if they died on the battle-field, Paradise should be theirs, and that they should have "girls of Paradise" for wives, in addition to their former wives; thus assuming that at death, the immortal souls of little girls go to Paradise, there to become the ghost-wives of ghost-soldiers of Mahomet. Who could ever have believed this dogma without first believing immortal-soulism? Obliterate this doctrine, and Mohammedanism is obsolete. Fruit cannot grow after the tree is killed; and the way to prevent people from eating poisonous fruit is to kill the tree that yields it: then it will not furnish the fatal poison. Is it right to keep the tree thriving, and call it a *good* tree, while it is the only tree that exists which yields such poisonous fruit, which has already poisoned its millions on millions?

3. Mahomet taught that there were not only seven heavens for good ghosts, but seven hells for evil ghosts—that there was a narrow foot-bridge, "finer than a hair," stretched from this world over these seven ghost-hells, reaching to heaven, for ghosts to walk over on: thus each ghost must become a practical wire-walker. A good ghost gets on to the bridge, and walks over hell No. 1, which is intensely hot; then over hell No. 2, which is very hot, but not so hot as the first; then over hell No. 3, which is hot, and like the other two, full of wailing ghosts, but not so hot as the others; then over hell No. 4, which is far from being a cool place; then over hell No. 5, which is a little cooler, but hot enough to burn human beings, if there were any there, but as only ghosts are there, and as they cannot burn up, nothing is consumed; then over hell No. 6, which is still cooler, but not in danger of freezing over; then over hell No. 7, which is the coolest hell in the catalogue; then he lands on the shore of heaven No. 1, where, if he is only an ordinarily good ghost, he must stop, and consider himself at home; if however he is a superlatively good ghost, he passes on through heavens Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and makes No. 7 his home.

A superlatively wicked ghost tries to walk this bridge, and as soon as he gets fairly over the center of hell No. 1, his foot slips, and he falls into the hottest hell of the seven. Another very

UMI

presence, where they cannot regard iniquity in their hearts to prevent their prayers from being heard, it would be perfectly proper to petition them to pray to God for us. Let not Protestants denounce this practice while claiming that the Virgin is alive: for such Protestants are more inconsistent than the Catholics. They insist that the tree which yields the fruit is good, but pronounce the fruit evil; while the Catholics say that both the tree and the fruit, in this instance, is good; though even Catholics themselves, in other cases, are compelled to pronounce some of the fruits of this tree evil.

But we pronounce both the tree and its fruits evil. *We* do not pray to the Virgin in heaven, because she is not there, but in the grave. We do not importune her to pray for us, because she is dead and cannot pray. Teach Catholics that Mary is dead, and they would pray to *God*, rather than to a dead virgin. Teach them the Bible doctrine, that the heaven to be enjoyed by the Virgin Mary, and all the other saints, is on the other side of the resurrection and judgment, and that Mary *herself*, instead of a ghostly shade, will be there, and that all the saints will be there as glorified personalities, and not as mere shadows, dressed in garments of moonshine; then they will desist from the practice of praying to an imaginary female ghost. But let not folly rebuke foolishness—let not Protestants, who claim that Mary has turned into a personal ghost, rebuke Catholics for praying to such a being.

2. No one would ever be foolish enough to pay the priest the last dollar to pray the ghost of a deceased friend out of purgatory, were it not for immortal-soulism. This fruit grows only on that tree. Let the fact be understood that death kills the entire man, and that he must remain dead till the resurrection, and that no *entity* or *personality* leaves man at death, but simply an *element* called the *spirit of life* returns to God who gave it, and Catholicism, with its ghostly purgatory, would become obsolete.

II. *Mohammedanism* is another fruit that grows on the tree of immortal-soulism.

1. Just establish the Scriptural fact in the minds of all men that death *kills* men, instead of subtracting ghostly entities, or spirit personalities, from them, to inhabit some other world, and no one could ever have been deceived by Mahomet's story of riding on a ghostly horse, from earth up through seven ghost-heavens, where he saw and conversed with Noah, Abraham,

Adam, and others. But instead of being deluded by this theological nonsense, they could have met him with the claim, these men are dead, and not alive; and in their graves instead of being in heaven.

2. Mahomet taught his soldiers that if they died on the battle-field, Paradise should be theirs, and that they should have "girls of Paradise" for wives, in addition to their former wives; thus assuming that at death, the immortal souls of little girls go to Paradise, there to become the ghost-wives of ghost-soldiers of Mahomet. Who could ever have believed this dogma without first believing immortal-soulism? Obliterate this doctrine, and Mohammedanism is obsolete. Fruit cannot grow after the tree is killed; and the way to prevent people from eating poisonous fruit is to kill the tree that yields it: then it will not furnish the fatal poison. Is it right to keep the tree thriving, and call it a *good* tree, while it is the only tree that exists which yields such poisonous fruit, which has already poisoned its millions on millions?

3. Mahomet taught that there were not only seven heavens for good ghosts, but seven hells for evil ghosts—that there was a narrow foot-bridge, "finer than a hair," stretched from this world over these seven ghost-hells, reaching to heaven, for ghosts to walk over on: thus each ghost must become a practical wire-walker. A good ghost gets on to the bridge, and walks over hell No. 1, which is intensely hot; then over hell No. 2, which is very hot, but not so hot as the first; then over hell No. 3, which is hot, and like the other two, full of wailing ghosts, but not so hot as the others; then over hell No. 4, which is far from being a cool place; then over hell No. 5, which is a little cooler, but hot enough to burn human beings, if there were any there, but as only ghosts are there, and as they cannot burn up, nothing is consumed; then over hell No. 6, which is still cooler, but not in danger of freezing over; then over hell No. 7, which is the coolest hell in the catalogue; then he lands on the shore of heaven No. 1, where, if he is only an ordinarily good ghost, he must stop, and consider himself at home; if however he is a superlatively good ghost, he passes on through heavens Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and makes No. 7 his home.

A superlatively wicked ghost tries to walk this bridge, and as soon as he gets fairly over the center of hell No. 1, his foot slips, and he falls into the hottest hell of the seven. Another very

UMI

wicked ghost tries to walk this bridge, not being quite as wicked as the other, and succeeds in walking over hell No. 1 in safety, but, alas! when he gets fairly over the center of hell No. 2, his foot slips, and down he goes into the fire. Another wicked ghost tries to walk the bridge, and passes over the first hell, and the second, but just as he gets over the center of hell No. 3, he tumbles into it. And thus, according to their grades of wickedness, they find a corresponding hell ready to receive them, the most wicked falling into the first, the next grade into the next hell, and so on to the end of the list, there being seven grades of ghosts, and seven hells to receive them.

This speculative nonsense never could have been believed by any living man, had not a belief in the immortality of the soul paved the way for its reception. When it is proved that death *kills* men, and that they cannot live again till the resurrection, this doctrine of a ghostly existence in a heaven of ghosts, or in a hell of ghosts, cannot be believed. Root up the tree, and we shall soon get rid of the fruit. It is labor lost to curse the fruit, and bless the tree that yields it.

III. That peculiar and obnoxious fruit called *Mormonism* also grows on this tree of immortal-soulism; and we had rather disown the tree than to own the fruit—a kind of fruit that can grow on no other tree. Hence, if we make the fruit evil, let us not eulogize the tree that produces it.

1. Mormonism originated in the claim that the ghost of a dead prophet, by the name of Maroni, who once lived on this continent, appeared to Joseph Smith, and revealed to him the whereabouts of certain plates of gold, said to contain the substance of what is now found in the Book of Mormon. If the devil had really tried to imitate God in making a Bible, and after having finished it, felt so much ashamed of it as to bury it in the ground, that ghost must have done a very naughty trick in telling "Joe" where to go and dig it up; and certainly a good ghost would not teach any man to dig up a bad book. If ghostly personalities leave men when they die, who can say that "Joe" never talked with a ghost? But if death really kills men, then down goes Mormonism.

2. One corner-stone of Mormonism is the claim that the ghost of John the Baptist ordained Joseph Smith to the priesthood of the Aaronic order. If it did not kill John the Baptist to cut his

head off, but merely subtracted a personal ghost from him, who can prove that this ghost did not ordain "Joe?" It is easy to say, "I don't believe it," but that does not disprove it. But if the act of severing a man's head from his body actually *kills* the man, instead of letting him out of a mortal prison, then John never ordained "Joe" Smith, for dead men cannot ordain people.

3. Another corner-stone to this system of Mormonism is the claim that Joseph Smith was ordained to the Melchisedec priesthood by the ghosts of Peter, James, and John. Now if they were possessed of personal ghosts while living, and if at death these ghosts flew away from the body, who knows but what they did ordain "Joe?" While alive they had power to ordain men; and if, instead of being dead, they are still alive, as personal ghosts, who can say they cannot now ordain men? "Joe" says they are alive; and so do you; "Joe" says they ordained him; you say you don't believe it; but your unbelief disproves nothing. But take the Bible position—"The dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9: 5); and that "there is *no work*, nor *device*, nor *knowledge*, nor *wisdom* in the grave [*sheol*—THE STATE OF THE DEAD] whither thou goest" (Eccl. 9: 10)—and Mormonism wilts and dies before it. Take away the doctrine of a personal ghost in man, and Smith's ghostly ordinations are *proved* (not *guessed*) to be hypocritical claims, and the superstructure built upon this foundation falls to the ground at once.

IV. "*Necromancy*," so strongly denounced in the Bible, is another fruit which grows on this mighty tree of immortal-soulism, whose shade fills the world, and whose branches extend to the ends of the earth. This tree is not only a large tree, but an old one. The acorn from which it has grown was planted by the devil, in the garden of Eden, nearly 6,000 years ago: "*Ye shall not surely die.*" It was only a little shrub at first, without branches; but in process of time its branches began to shoot out, one after another, till these great branches of Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, and various other *isms* not only grew vigorously, but filled the earth with their evil fruit. But the first branch was "necromancy," or a *pretended* consultation with the dead. If this practice had been a reality, instead of being a mere deception, God would never have forbidden it; for if our friends are really alive, our intercourse with them would be for our benefit, and God never forbids that which is for our

UMI

wicked ghost tries to walk this bridge, not being quite as wicked as the other, and succeeds in walking over hell No. 1 in safety, but, alas! when he gets fairly over the center of hell No. 2, his foot slips, and down he goes into the fire. Another wicked ghost tries to walk the bridge, and passes over the first hell, and the second, but just as he gets over the center of hell No. 3, he tumbles into it. And thus, according to their grades of wickedness, they find a corresponding hell ready to receive them, the most wicked falling into the first, the next grade into the next hell, and so on to the end of the list, there being seven grades of ghosts, and seven hells to receive them.

This speculative nonsense never could have been believed by any living man, had not a belief in the immortality of the soul paved the way for its reception. When it is proved that death *kills* men, and that they cannot live again till the resurrection, this doctrine of a ghostly existence in a heaven of ghosts, or in a hell of ghosts, cannot be believed. Root up the tree, and we shall soon get rid of the fruit. It is labor lost to curse the fruit, and bless the tree that yields it.

III. That peculiar and obnoxious fruit called *Mormonism* also grows on this tree of immortal-soulism; and we had rather disown the tree than to own the fruit—a kind of fruit that can grow on no other tree. Hence, if we make the fruit evil, let us not eulogize the tree that produces it.

1. Mormonism originated in the claim that the ghost of a dead prophet, by the name of Maroni, who once lived on this continent, appeared to Joseph Smith, and revealed to him the whereabouts of certain plates of gold, said to contain the substance of what is now found in the Book of Mormon. If the devil had really tried to imitate God in making a Bible, and after having finished it, felt so much ashamed of it as to bury it in the ground, that ghost must have done a very naughty trick in telling "Joe" where to go and dig it up; and certainly a good ghost would not teach any man to dig up a bad book. If ghostly personalities leave men when they die, who can say that "Joe" never talked with a ghost? But if death really kills men, then down goes Mormonism.

2. One corner-stone of Mormonism is the claim that the ghost of John the Baptist ordained Joseph Smith to the priesthood of the Aaronic order. If it did not kill John the Baptist to cut his

head off, but merely subtracted a personal ghost from him, who can prove that this ghost did not ordain "Joe?" It is easy to say, "I don't believe it," but that does not disprove it. But if the act of severing a man's head from his body actually *kills* the man, instead of letting him out of a mortal prison, then John never ordained "Joe" Smith, for dead men cannot ordain people.

3. Another corner-stone to this system of Mormonism is the claim that Joseph Smith was ordained to the Melchisedec priesthood by the ghosts of Peter, James, and John. Now if they were possessed of personal ghosts while living, and if at death these ghosts flew away from the body, who knows but what they did ordain "Joe?" While alive they had power to ordain men; and if, instead of being dead, they are still alive, as personal ghosts, who can say they cannot now ordain men? "Joe" says they are alive; and so do you; "Joe" says they ordained him; you say you don't believe it; but your unbelief disproves nothing. But take the Bible position—"The dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9: 5); and that "there is *no work*, nor *device*, nor *knowledge*, nor *wisdom* in the grave [*sheol*—THE STATE OF THE DEAD] whither thou goest" (Eccl. 9: 10)—and Mormonism wilts and dies before it. Take away the doctrine of a personal ghost in man, and Smith's ghostly ordinations are *proved* (not *guessed*) to be hypocritical claims, and the superstructure built upon this foundation falls to the ground at once.

IV. "*Necromancy*," so strongly denounced in the Bible, is another fruit which grows on this mighty tree of immortal-soulism, whose shade fills the world, and whose branches extend to the ends of the earth. This tree is not only a large tree, but an old one. The acorn from which it has grown was planted by the devil, in the garden of Eden, nearly 6,000 years ago: "*Ye shall not surely die.*" It was only a little shrub at first, without branches; but in process of time its branches began to shoot out, one after another, till these great branches of Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, and various other *isms* not only grew vigorously, but filled the earth with their evil fruit. But the first branch was "necromancy," or a *pretended* consultation with the dead. If this practice had been a reality, instead of being a mere deception, God would never have forbidden it; for if our friends are really alive, our intercourse with them would be for our benefit, and God never forbids that which is for our

UMI

good; but "necromancy" being of Satanic origin, in disguise, God forbade the deceptive practice.

V. *Transmigration* is another fruitful branch of this tree. It claims that the man proper survives the stroke of death, and passes into some other person, or into some animal, and lives in that tabernacle till released again by death, then goes into another, &c., &c. That is, a man may die to-day, and to-morrow his deathless soul may dwell in a mouse; but the cat soon comes along, and liberates the captive by killing the mouse; next day this same soul resides in an elephant, which dies in process of time, thus liberating the captive once more: but it soon finds a home in the whale, till the sailor's harpoon sets him free, when he enters a human body again, and so on, experiencing change after change. Let it be fairly understood that death *kills man entirely*, instead of unsheathing a personal ghost to live elsewhere; and that all the ghost that man gives up at death is the "breath of life," or spirit of life, which instead of being a personality within a personality is only an *element* producing life in a personality, which once came from God as an *element*, and not as a personality, and is to return to God again just as it came from him, as an element, and not as a personality, and all this transmigrationism, and its kindred *isms*, would go out of existence. Death ends life, instead of reviving it; and only the resurrection can recommence it, at the appearing of the Life-giver.

VI. *Hero-worship* is the bitter fruit growing on another branch of this tree. Let the fact be believed, that death *kills* heroes, and all other men, instead of unhousing ghostly personalities, and sending them off to some remote realm, and no one would ever have engaged in this species of worship, as millions have done for centuries.

VII. The Indian, fancying that death, instead of ending his life, will simply subtract a spirit-Indian from his body, tickles himself with the silly notion of chasing the spirit-deer in a "happy hunting-ground." And why not come to the conclusion that if death takes a live Indian out of a dead one, that it just as really takes a live *deer* out of a dead one? Observation favors the latter idea as strongly as the former. And the same Bible that speaks of the "spirit of man," speaks as plainly of the "*spirit of the beast*," and that, too, in the same breath, using also the same original word for "spirit" in both cases. (Eccl. 3: 21.) Hence,

if "the spirit of man" signifies a spirit-personality, or spirit-man within the material man, then the "spirit of the beast" just as really signifies a *spirit-beast* within the material beast, and there is no possible escape from the revolting conclusion; but if the "spirit of the beast" only signifies the spirit of life, the spirit of man also signifies the same, for the same writer who here speaks of "the *ruach* [spirit] of man," and "the *ruach* [spirit] of the beast," also states in the same discourse, concerning men and beasts—"They all have *one ruach*" (v. 19): not one ghostly *entity*, but one spirit of life.

If we must convert the "spirit of man" into an invisible man, let us be reasonable, and convert the "spirit of the beast" into an invisible beast, and then help the poor Indian chase the spirit-deer through the forests and over the prairies of *Ghostdom*. Don't tell the Indian that there will be no spirit-deer there, unless you also tell him there will be no spirit-Indian there, for there is just as good ground for the one claim as for the other.

VIII. *Spiritualism* is a large and fruitful branch of this popular theological tree. It is needless to spend time in telling how intensely bitter this fruit is. This fact is well understood. It denies God, except as an unorganized principle pervading all nature; it denies Jesus Christ as a divine personage; denies the literal resurrection of the dead; denies a coming judgment; denies the second coming of Christ; denies the existence of a literal devil; denies the inspiration of the Bible; and makes the existence of personal ghosts its chief corner-stone. It claims that ghosts enter into different spheres, and there progress; talks about a summer-land for the shades of the dead, and yet represents them as constantly coming back to the winter-land from which they have gone. But this vile system could never have existed without immortal-soulism as its basis. Don't curse the fruit, and at the same time kiss the parent tree. Lay the ax of truth at the foot of the tree of immortal-soulism, and hew it down, and that act is sure to kill Spiritualism, Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Necromancy, Transmigrationism, Hero-worship, Spirit-deer-hunting, and many similar dogmas. Can a tree yield so much evil fruit, the very existence of which fruit depends upon the existence of this tree, and could never have come into existence without this tree, and still be a good tree? Is it possible for a tree to produce *all* evil fruit, and *no* good fruit, and still be a good tree?

UMI

good; but "necromancy" being of Satanic origin, in disguise, God forbade the deceptive practice.

V. *Transmigration* is another fruitful branch of this tree. It claims that the man proper survives the stroke of death, and passes into some other person, or into some animal, and lives in that tabernacle till released again by death, then goes into another, &c., &c. That is, a man may die to-day, and to-morrow his deathless soul may dwell in a mouse; but the cat soon comes along, and liberates the captive by killing the mouse; next day this same soul resides in an elephant, which dies in process of time, thus liberating the captive once more: but it soon finds a home in the whale, till the sailor's harpoon sets him free, when he enters a human body again, and so on, experiencing change after change. Let it be fairly understood that death *kills man entirely*, instead of unsheathing a personal ghost to live elsewhere; and that all the ghost that man gives up at death is the "breath of life," or spirit of life, which instead of being a personality within a personality is only an *element* producing life in a personality, which once came from God as an *element*, and not as a personality, and is to return to God again just as it came from him, as an element, and not as a personality, and all this transmigrationism, and its kindred *isms*, would go out of existence. Death ends life, instead of reviving it; and only the resurrection can recommence it, at the appearing of the Life-giver.

VI. *Hero-worship* is the bitter fruit growing on another branch of this tree. Let the fact be believed, that death *kills* heroes, and all other men, instead of unhousing ghostly personalities, and sending them off to some remote realm, and no one would ever have engaged in this species of worship, as millions have done for centuries.

VII. The Indian, fancying that death, instead of ending his life, will simply subtract a spirit-Indian from his body, tickles himself with the silly notion of chasing the spirit-deer in a "happy hunting-ground." And why not come to the conclusion that if death takes a live Indian out of a dead one, that it just as really takes a live *deer* out of a dead one? Observation favors the latter idea as strongly as the former. And the same Bible that speaks of the "spirit of man," speaks as plainly of the "*spirit of the beast*," and that, too, in the same breath, using also the same original word for "spirit" in both cases. (Eccl. 3: 21.) Hence,

if "the spirit of man" signifies a spirit-personality, or spirit-man within the material man, then the "spirit of the beast" just as really signifies a *spirit-beast* within the material beast, and there is no possible escape from the revolting conclusion; but if the "spirit of the beast" only signifies the spirit of life, the spirit of man also signifies the same, for the same writer who here speaks of "the *ruach* [spirit] of man," and "the *ruach* [spirit] of the beast," also states in the same discourse, concerning men and beasts—"They all have *one ruach*" (v. 19): not one ghostly *entity*, but one spirit of life.

If we must convert the "spirit of man" into an invisible man, let us be reasonable, and convert the "spirit of the beast" into an invisible beast, and then help the poor Indian chase the spirit-deer through the forests and over the prairies of *Ghostdom*. Don't tell the Indian that there will be no spirit-deer there, unless you also tell him there will be no spirit-Indian there, for there is just as good ground for the one claim as for the other.

VIII. *Spiritualism* is a large and fruitful branch of this popular theological tree. It is needless to spend time in telling how intensely bitter this fruit is. This fact is well understood. It denies God, except as an unorganized principle pervading all nature; it denies Jesus Christ as a divine personage; denies the literal resurrection of the dead; denies a coming judgment; denies the second coming of Christ; denies the existence of a literal devil; denies the inspiration of the Bible; and makes the existence of personal ghosts its chief corner-stone. It claims that ghosts enter into different spheres, and there progress; talks about a summer-land for the shades of the dead, and yet represents them as constantly coming back to the winter-land from which they have gone. But this vile system could never have existed without immortal-soulism as its basis. Don't curse the fruit, and at the same time kiss the parent tree. Lay the ax of truth at the foot of the tree of immortal-soulism, and hew it down, and that act is sure to kill Spiritualism, Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Necromancy, Transmigrationism, Hero-worship, Spirit-deer-hunting, and many similar dogmas. Can a tree yield so much evil fruit, the very existence of which fruit depends upon the existence of this tree, and could never have come into existence without this tree, and still be a good tree? Is it possible for a tree to produce *all* evil fruit, and *no* good fruit, and still be a good tree?

UMI

After seeing how much evil fruit it produces, will some one seek to partially redeem its reputation by saying that it also yields some good fruit? This I deny emphatically. There never has been a particle of good fruit on it, *the existence of which depends upon the existence of the tree.* You may stick apples upon a thorn tree, but the thorn tree never gave them an existence. So you may stick some good fruit on to the tree of immortal-soulism, but it is not a product of the tree. Not one item of Bible theology depends upon immortal-soulism for its existence, while many noted errors are its legitimate offspring. The judgment to come, the resurrection, the celestial kingdom, the giving of immortality to the saints, the giving of crowns of glory to the redeemed ones, and in fact every feature of the plan of salvation from its incipient stage to its mighty completion, are truths that exist independent of immortal-soulism. *Blot out that principle*, and these truths shine as brilliantly as ever; while the cardinal errors of Christendom and Heathendom are thereby plunged into the mighty sea of oblivion, to rise no more.

IX. *Universalism* is another fruit of this great tree. With truthfulness they insist that immortality can no more suffer *pain* than it can suffer death, for pain is the road to death; hence, they deny that the wicked are to be shut out of the kingdom in the world to come. Taking it for granted, without proof, and contrary to evidence, that the souls of the wicked are immortal, and knowing that immortality cannot feel pain, they come to the conclusion that endless pain is not to be experienced by the sinner, and then omit to learn that God has threatened them with the second death; and overlooking this fact, they have blindly come to the conclusion that all men, regardless of character, will finally be saved. They insist that the soul is a part of God, and that consequently it cannot *suffer* nor *die*, as God cannot inflict either suffering or death upon himself; forgetting that this assumption charges all the sin in the world directly upon God, as it is "*the* soul that sinneth" (Ezek. 18: 2); that is, if the soul is a part of God, it is a part of God that sinneth. One of two conclusions must be correct: the soul is either a part of God, or a part of man; if a part of God, it is not only proved immortal, but God is proved to be the author of sin; a conclusion too revolting to be entertained for a moment; but if the soul is a *part of man*, then it is *mortal*, as man bears no higher Bible appellation, in his present state, than "*mortal man*" (Job 4: 17); hence, if the soul is a part of "mortal man," it must be mortal, and capable of experiencing the "second death," agreeing with the statement, "The soul that sinneth, it shall *die*" (Ezek. 18: 2), and "The wages of sin is *death*." (Rom. 6: 23.)

X. *Endless torment* is another fruit of immortal-soulism. Assuming for a fact—what never has been proved, and never can be proved—that the soul is immortal, the claim is set up that there will be no end to the sinner's suffering in hell; that even after unnumbered millions of ages shall have elapsed, death cannot come to his relief. This shocking slander on the character of God is based, mainly, on the unscriptural doctrine of the soul's immortality, while the Scriptures abound with threats of a death penalty against sinners, all of which statements must be made to signify directly the *reverse* of what they say, to harmonize with this dogma.

But we are told that we need endless torment as an inducement to move sinners to repentance. This is a spurious motive. Those who are moved only by the principle of fear cease to move when that principle ceases to propel them. Suppose I say to my child, Do you love father? and receive the reply, No, sir; whereupon I take a whip, and make this threat: Now if you don't love father, I will whip you as long as I live! If I extort love on this principle, how much would it be worth? and how long would it last?

Theology represents God as saying to the sinner, Do you love me? The practical answer is, *No*. Then God is represented as holding the great hell-whip over the sinner, and saying, If you don't love me, I'll whip you as long as I live. Under the spell of fear, the sinner professes love; but how much is it worth? and how long will it last after the whip is out of sight?

Unless there is a principle of love underlying this principle of fear, the service of God is only a slavish task to engage in, and Christian duty is ever irksome to discharge; and no wonder that the world is flooded with backsliders as a result of this principle. It moves men on the very principle that the hard-hearted sailor is moved to tears and prayers in the threatening storm; but let the storm pass, and his piety passes with it. But when "the goodness of God leadeth men to repentance," and when "we love him because he first loved us," we are moved upon by the genuine motive, instead of being influenced by a motive totally selfish and slavish, leading us to act merely for

UMI

After seeing how much evil fruit it produces, will some one seek to partially redeem its reputation by saying that it also yields some good fruit? This I deny emphatically. There never has been a particle of good fruit on it, *the existence of which depends upon the existence of the tree.* You may stick apples upon a thorn tree, but the thorn tree never gave them an existence. So you may stick some good fruit on to the tree of immortal-soulism, but it is not a product of the tree. Not one item of Bible theology depends upon immortal-soulism for its existence, while many noted errors are its legitimate offspring. The judgment to come, the resurrection, the celestial kingdom, the giving of immortality to the saints, the giving of crowns of glory to the redeemed ones, and in fact every feature of the plan of salvation from its incipient stage to its mighty completion, are truths that exist independent of immortal-soulism. *Blot out that principle*, and these truths shine as brilliantly as ever; while the cardinal errors of Christendom and Heathendom are thereby plunged into the mighty sea of oblivion, to rise no more.

IX. *Universalism* is another fruit of this great tree. With truthfulness they insist that immortality can no more suffer *pain* than it can suffer death, for pain is the road to death; hence, they deny that the wicked are to be shut out of the kingdom in the world to come. Taking it for granted, without proof, and contrary to evidence, that the souls of the wicked are immortal, and knowing that immortality cannot feel pain, they come to the conclusion that endless pain is not to be experienced by the sinner, and then omit to learn that God has threatened them with the second death; and overlooking this fact, they have blindly come to the conclusion that all men, regardless of character, will finally be saved. They insist that the soul is a part of God, and that consequently it cannot *suffer* nor *die*, as God cannot inflict either suffering or death upon himself; forgetting that this assumption charges all the sin in the world directly upon God, as it is "*the* soul that sinneth" (Ezek. 18: 2); that is, if the soul is a part of God, it is a part of God that sinneth. One of two conclusions must be correct: the soul is either a part of God, or a part of man; if a part of God, it is not only proved immortal, but God is proved to be the author of sin; a conclusion too revolting to be entertained for a moment; but if the soul is a *part of man*, then it is *mortal*, as man bears no higher Bible appellation, in his present state, than "*mortal man*" (Job 4: 17); hence, if the soul is a part of "mortal man," it must be mortal, and capable of experiencing the "second death," agreeing with the statement, "The soul that sinneth, it shall *die*" (Ezek. 18: 2), and "The wages of sin is *death*." (Rom. 6: 23.)

X. *Endless torment* is another fruit of immortal-soulism. Assuming for a fact—what never has been proved, and never can be proved—that the soul is immortal, the claim is set up that there will be no end to the sinner's suffering in hell; that even after unnumbered millions of ages shall have elapsed, death cannot come to his relief. This shocking slander on the character of God is based, mainly, on the unscriptural doctrine of the soul's immortality, while the Scriptures abound with threats of a death penalty against sinners, all of which statements must be made to signify directly the *reverse* of what they say, to harmonize with this dogma.

But we are told that we need endless torment as an inducement to move sinners to repentance. This is a spurious motive. Those who are moved only by the principle of fear cease to move when that principle ceases to propel them. Suppose I say to my child, Do you love father? and receive the reply, No, sir; whereupon I take a whip, and make this threat: Now if you don't love father, I will whip you as long as I live! If I extort love on this principle, how much would it be worth? and how long would it last?

Theology represents God as saying to the sinner, Do you love me? The practical answer is, *No*. Then God is represented as holding the great hell-whip over the sinner, and saying, If you don't love me, I'll whip you as long as I live. Under the spell of fear, the sinner professes love; but how much is it worth? and how long will it last after the whip is out of sight?

Unless there is a principle of love underlying this principle of fear, the service of God is only a slavish task to engage in, and Christian duty is ever irksome to discharge; and no wonder that the world is flooded with backsliders as a result of this principle. It moves men on the very principle that the hard-hearted sailor is moved to tears and prayers in the threatening storm; but let the storm pass, and his piety passes with it. But when "the goodness of God leadeth men to repentance," and when "we love him because he first loved us," we are moved upon by the genuine motive, instead of being influenced by a motive totally selfish and slavish, leading us to act merely for

UMI

the purpose of escaping torment unending. Many are truly converted who are influenced by both of these motives, but the motive of fear exclusively is worthless. It is right to present the "terrors of the Lord," but not the terrors of theology.

It is no help to the cause of Christ to threaten the sinner with a retribution the most fearful and frightful that imagination can grasp, with a design to *scare* him into submission; for when the *fright* is over, the propelling power is extinct, and relaxation is the result. Let men be allured by the lovely character of God, and by his "exceeding great and precious promises," and be made to feel that he is truly their real friend, and is seeking their welfare, and not at the same time planning to eternally inflict unmitigated anguish and endless agony and pain on any of his creatures, and if anything will successfully reach their hearts, this will.

It is true that God threatens the sinner with retribution for sin, on the one hand, while he offers him glory on the other hand; but it is a retribution which, in the first place, appears consistent with the character of a merciful and just God, and in the second place does no look like a mighty effort to scare men, or like an unbounded display of blind rage, unbecoming the character of Deity. The sinner never had any claim upon God for existence. God saw fit to give him a trial existence, with the offer of endless life on condition of faithfulness. In case of unfaithfulness, God does him no injustice in inflicting a punishment upon him for his sins, ultimating in the loss of life, after the judgment, by the infliction of the "*second death.*"

An endless residence of deathless sinners in a literal hell of fire is beginning to look so shocking in the eyes of enlightened people, that there is a revised edition of hell being arranged by theologians, which reduces hell to a mere *guilty conscience.* Well, that is changing from *endless* fire to *no* fire with a mighty stride. I know it looks unreasonable that literal fire should burn immaterial ghosts; and having reduced sinners to mere ghostly shadows, it is quite natural to reduce the fire to *conscience:* but how would some Scriptures sound when quoted with this definition of hell? *e. g.* "Not that thy whole body should be cast into *a guilty conscience:*" or "destroy both soul and body in *a guilty conscience.*" But when these guilty consciences are "*seared*" by an excess of sin, *this* fire burns low. Guilty conscience stings

the man terribly who has committed the first murder, but after he has murdered forty men, conscience becomes easier, being "*seared.*" Besides this, guilty conscience is not the result of judgment, nor after the judgment. The guilty conscience of the horsethief is no part of his punishment. So with the sinner, "who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." Guilt for crime is one thing, and punishment for crime is another thing.

XI. The *spiritual resurrection* theory grows out of immortal-soulism. It sets up the claim that there is a spiritual body within each material body, and that when the material body dies, the spiritual body is resurrected therefrom, leaving the material body to sleep in the dust to all eternity; thus reducing man's future existence to a mere phantom or spectre. But is this theory true? Why may it not be, if the soul is immortal? Why ever reanimate the body, if the soul is a personality independent of the body, and can be better off without the body than with it? But the voice of Inspiration cries, "The *dead* shall be raised" (1 Cor. 15: 52); and, "Thy *dead* men shall *live;* together with my *dead body* shall they arise." (Is. 26: 19.) If there is a spiritual body existing cotemporary with the natural body, the spiritual body being immortal, the resurrection cannot be affirmed of the spiritual body, for it is a "*dead body*" that is to "arise," instead of a *deathless* body. Hence, the resurrection, instead of extracting a live body from a dead one, makes a "DEAD BODY" "*arise,*" and "*live,*" and "sing." Paul, in speaking of the spiritual body, does not even hint that it dwells within the natural body as a distinct personality, to be subtracted therefrom at the hour of death; but instead of teaching that the one exists cotemporary with the other, he plainly establishes the fact that they exist *successively;* that is, that the natural body first has its day, and goes into the grave; then at the resurrection the same body is immortalized, thus becoming a spiritual *body*, but not a bodiless spirit. And Christ, in his resurrected, immortalized state, is presented as a true sample of a spiritual body, being thereby "*made a quickening spirit*" (1 Cor. 15: 45), having "*flesh and bones*" (Luke 24: 39); being in this respect unlike an angelic spirit, which "*hath not* flesh and bones." Once Christ possessed a "natural body" like ours; but at his resurrection, he became a *spirit-body*, or spiritual body; and our spiritual body will come into existence by the same process.

UMI

the purpose of escaping torment unending. Many are truly converted who are influenced by both of these motives, but the motive of fear exclusively is worthless. It is right to present the "terrors of the Lord," but not the terrors of theology.

It is no help to the cause of Christ to threaten the sinner with a retribution the most fearful and frightful that imagination can grasp, with a design to *scare* him into submission; for when the *fright* is over, the propelling power is extinct, and relaxation is the result. Let men be allured by the lovely character of God, and by his "exceeding great and precious promises," and be made to feel that he is truly their real friend, and is seeking their welfare, and not at the same time planning to eternally inflict unmitigated anguish and endless agony and pain on any of his creatures, and if anything will successfully reach their hearts, this will.

It is true that God threatens the sinner with retribution for sin, on the one hand, while he offers him glory on the other hand; but it is a retribution which, in the first place, appears consistent with the character of a merciful and just God, and in the second place does no look like a mighty effort to scare men, or like an unbounded display of blind rage, unbecoming the character of Deity. The sinner never had any claim upon God for existence. God saw fit to give him a trial existence, with the offer of endless life on condition of faithfulness. In case of unfaithfulness, God does him no injustice in inflicting a punishment upon him for his sins, ultimating in the loss of life, after the judgment, by the infliction of the "*second death.*"

An endless residence of deathless sinners in a literal hell of fire is beginning to look so shocking in the eyes of enlightened people, that there is a revised edition of hell being arranged by theologians, which reduces hell to a mere *guilty conscience.* Well, that is changing from *endless* fire to *no* fire with a mighty stride. I know it looks unreasonable that literal fire should burn immaterial ghosts; and having reduced sinners to mere ghostly shadows, it is quite natural to reduce the fire to *conscience:* but how would some Scriptures sound when quoted with this definition of hell? *e. g.* "Not that thy whole body should be cast into *a guilty conscience:*" or "destroy both soul and body in *a guilty conscience.*" But when these guilty consciences are "*seared*" by an excess of sin, *this* fire burns low. Guilty conscience stings

the man terribly who has committed the first murder, but after he has murdered forty men, conscience becomes easier, being "*seared.*" Besides this, guilty conscience is not the result of judgment, nor after the judgment. The guilty conscience of the horsethief is no part of his punishment. So with the sinner, "who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." Guilt for crime is one thing, and punishment for crime is another thing.

XI. The *spiritual resurrection* theory grows out of immortal-soulism. It sets up the claim that there is a spiritual body within each material body, and that when the material body dies, the spiritual body is resurrected therefrom, leaving the material body to sleep in the dust to all eternity; thus reducing man's future existence to a mere phantom or spectre. But is this theory true? Why may it not be, if the soul is immortal? Why ever reanimate the body, if the soul is a personality independent of the body, and can be better off without the body than with it? But the voice of Inspiration cries, "The *dead* shall be raised" (1 Cor. 15: 52); and, "Thy *dead* men shall *live;* together with my *dead body* shall they arise." (Is. 26: 19.) If there is a spiritual body existing cotemporary with the natural body, the spiritual body being immortal, the resurrection cannot be affirmed of the spiritual body, for it is a "*dead body*" that is to "arise," instead of a *deathless* body. Hence, the resurrection, instead of extracting a live body from a dead one, makes a "DEAD BODY" "*arise,*" and "*live,*" and "sing." Paul, in speaking of the spiritual body, does not even hint that it dwells within the natural body as a distinct personality, to be subtracted therefrom at the hour of death; but instead of teaching that the one exists cotemporary with the other, he plainly establishes the fact that they exist *successively;* that is, that the natural body first has its day, and goes into the grave; then at the resurrection the same body is immortalized, thus becoming a spiritual *body*, but not a bodiless spirit. And Christ, in his resurrected, immortalized state, is presented as a true sample of a spiritual body, being thereby "*made a quickening spirit*" (1 Cor. 15: 45), having "*flesh and bones*" (Luke 24: 39); being in this respect unlike an angelic spirit, which "*hath not* flesh and bones." Once Christ possessed a "natural body" like ours; but at his resurrection, he became a *spirit-body*, or spiritual body; and our spiritual body will come into existence by the same process.

UMI

The Apostle affirms, "That was *not first* which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and AFTERWARD that which is spiritual." We now have a natural body, and, "it is sown a natural body; it is RAISED a *spiritual* BODY" (1 Cor. 15: 44): not a spirit without a body. Here the true order is given: "*first*," the natural body: "*afterward*," the spiritual body. The natural body has its day first, and then enters the grave; but at the resurrection, "it is *raised* a spiritual body:" but the saint has no spiritual body this side of the resurrection. This is Heaven's theology concerning the spiritual body, and is subversive of spiritual-resurrection theology.

XII. The doctrine of the *spiritual coming of Christ*, at the death of his saints, to convey them to a sky-kingdom, is a sprout from the tree of immortal-soulism. Paul tells us that we are to "wait for God's Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead" (1 Thess. 1 : 9, 10), and this proves that the coming of Christ will be *personal*—the coming of a person who had once been "*dead*," instead of some spiritual manifestation, as a substitute for this event; and the same apostle also affirms, "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the *second* time" (Heb. 9 : 28), and this precludes a plurality of future advents of the Savior, and allows us to look for only one, instead of legions, and that one a personal coming. Christ tells us the *object* of his coming: "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself" (John 14 : 3), negating the claim that they are previously received by him. The following facts are here set forth: (1) The very Jesus who was once "*dead*" is to come; (2) it is to be his "*second*" coming; (3) not till then will he "*receive*" the saints unto himself; hence the fallacy of the claim that he comes spiritually, thousands of times every year, to transport saints to another world.

XIII. The unscriptural doctrine of *rewards before the day of judgment* is an offshoot from immortal-soulism. If the soul exists as a distinct personality, after the death of the body, it is quite natural to conclude it must have a dwelling-place in some locality, and that it must there be either happy or unhappy; so theologians have generally concluded to assign heaven to good souls, and hell to bad ones, as soon as death liberates them from the body, regardless of the affirmation that Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing*" (2 Tim. 4 : 1), and in opposition to the Revelator's testimony concerning the scene due

under the sounding of the seventh trumpet: "Thy wrath is come, and the time of the *dead*, that they should be *judged*, and that thou shouldest give REWARD unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great." (Rev. 11 : 18.) That this is the true epoch for the giving of rewards is further evident from the testimony of Christ on different occasions, in the following language: "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and THEN he shall *reward* EVERY man according to his works." (Matt. 16: 27.) Here the time of "*reward*" is specified as plainly as language can be framed together; and we are not only informed here that reward is due when Christ shall "come," but that "EVERY MAN" will then be rewarded; thus proving that "*every man*" will remain unrewarded till that time. About sixty years later, many years subsequent to Christ's ascension, Jesus reiterates this same sentiment, in almost the same phraseology: "Behold, I come quickly; and my *reward* is with me, to give EVERY man according as his work shall be." (Rev. 22 : 12.) Reward is here located at Christ's coming, not for a few merely, but for "*every man*:" and "every man" includes the entire race of Adam.

Were it not for immortal-soulism, the doctrine of reward at death, so contrary to Bible testimony, could never have existed. But when the theory obtains that death liberates a personal ghost from the body, instead of totally killing the man, it becomes a necessity to coin up the doctrine of a reward for ghosts prior to the judgment-day. Some, however, who feel the force of Scripture testimony on this subject, wish to split the difference between truth and error on this point, and plead for a part of the reward at death, admitting that a part is due at the resurrection also. Now if inspired testimony is partly true about the time of reward, may it not be wholly true? Not a word can be found in the entire book of God about two different periods of reward for one person. Besides, it would look unlike God to give a saint a part of his crown at one time, and another part at another; a part of the palm of victory at one time, and another part at another time. It is no part of his work to split crowns, or deal out rewards in installments. No reward is due till the day of settlement arrives, and then it will *all* come. If any part of the reward can be obtained before the judgment-day, why not all of it? and then what need of a judgment at all?

UMI

The Apostle affirms, "That was *not first* which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and AFTERWARD that which is spiritual." We now have a natural body, and, "it is sown a natural body; it is RAISED a *spiritual* BODY" (1 Cor. 15: 44): not a spirit without a body. Here the true order is given: "*first*," the natural body: "*afterward*," the spiritual body. The natural body has its day first, and then enters the grave; but at the resurrection, "it is *raised* a spiritual body:" but the saint has no spiritual body this side of the resurrection. This is Heaven's theology concerning the spiritual body, and is subversive of spiritual-resurrection theology.

XII. The doctrine of the *spiritual coming of Christ*, at the death of his saints, to convey them to a sky-kingdom, is a sprout from the tree of immortal-soulism. Paul tells us that we are to "wait for God's Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead" (1 Thess. 1 : 9, 10), and this proves that the coming of Christ will be *personal*—the coming of a person who had once been "*dead*," instead of some spiritual manifestation, as a substitute for this event; and the same apostle also affirms, "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the *second* time" (Heb. 9 : 28), and this precludes a plurality of future advents of the Savior, and allows us to look for only one, instead of legions, and that one a personal coming. Christ tells us the *object* of his coming: "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself" (John 14 : 3), negating the claim that they are previously received by him. The following facts are here set forth: (1) The very Jesus who was once "*dead*" is to come; (2) it is to be his "*second*" coming; (3) not till then will he "*receive*" the saints unto himself; hence the fallacy of the claim that he comes spiritually, thousands of times every year, to transport saints to another world.

XIII. The unscriptural doctrine of *rewards before the day of judgment* is an offshoot from immortal-soulism. If the soul exists as a distinct personality, after the death of the body, it is quite natural to conclude it must have a dwelling-place in some locality, and that it must there be either happy or unhappy; so theologians have generally concluded to assign heaven to good souls, and hell to bad ones, as soon as death liberates them from the body, regardless of the affirmation that Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing*" (2 Tim. 4 : 1), and in opposition to the Revelator's testimony concerning the scene due

under the sounding of the seventh trumpet: "Thy wrath is come, and the time of the *dead*, that they should be *judged*, and that thou shouldest give REWARD unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great." (Rev. 11 : 18.) That this is the true epoch for the giving of rewards is further evident from the testimony of Christ on different occasions, in the following language: "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and THEN he shall *reward* EVERY man according to his works." (Matt. 16: 27.) Here the time of "*reward*" is specified as plainly as language can be framed together; and we are not only informed here that reward is due when Christ shall "come," but that "EVERY MAN" will then be rewarded; thus proving that "*every man*" will remain unrewarded till that time. About sixty years later, many years subsequent to Christ's ascension, Jesus reiterates this same sentiment, in almost the same phraseology: "Behold, I come quickly; and my *reward* is with me, to give EVERY man according as his work shall be." (Rev. 22 : 12.) Reward is here located at Christ's coming, not for a few merely, but for "*every man*:" and "every man" includes the entire race of Adam.

Were it not for immortal-soulism, the doctrine of reward at death, so contrary to Bible testimony, could never have existed. But when the theory obtains that death liberates a personal ghost from the body, instead of totally killing the man, it becomes a necessity to coin up the doctrine of a reward for ghosts prior to the judgment-day. Some, however, who feel the force of Scripture testimony on this subject, wish to split the difference between truth and error on this point, and plead for a part of the reward at death, admitting that a part is due at the resurrection also. Now if inspired testimony is partly true about the time of reward, may it not be wholly true? Not a word can be found in the entire book of God about two different periods of reward for one person. Besides, it would look unlike God to give a saint a part of his crown at one time, and another part at another; a part of the palm of victory at one time, and another part at another time. It is no part of his work to split crowns, or deal out rewards in installments. No reward is due till the day of settlement arrives, and then it will *all* come. If any part of the reward can be obtained before the judgment-day, why not all of it? and then what need of a judgment at all?

UMI

Has not God located reward subsequent to the judgment, without excepting any part of it? Then why should men decide that God's plan is *partly* wrong, while admitting that it is partly right? Rather "let God be true," not in part only, but fully true, even if immortal-soulism suffers in consequence, as it assuredly will; for the doctrine of reward before the judgment, in part or in full, either for saint or sinner, could never have come into existence independent of immortal-soulism—that great tree of theology which puts forth so many branches of error, loaded with evil fruit. Let the tree be hewn down, and these various branches of error will fall with it.

XIV. The doctrine of a *sky-kingdom* as the future home of the saints is another branch of error belonging to the same tree, originating from the impression that there is an embryo-angel within the saint, and that, when let out of its mortal prison-house, it will soar to the home of the angels on high. But the reader of the Bible is aware that God primarily created our world, and pronounced it not only "*good*," but "VERY GOOD," and that he placed a good man in it, on trial for endless life, with the "tree of life" before him, that at some time in his history, if faithful, he might "eat and live forever." Live *where?* In the very world God created on purpose for him to live in. If sin had never entered, this would have been the home of good men "forever;" and when sin is *removed*, and its results are overwhelmed in oblivion, this same realm will become the home of the good of every age, beyond the judgment-scene; and thus the original purpose of Jehovah in creating this globe will be carried out—earth will be peopled with a race of good men that will "*live forever*," in a Paradise that will bloom under the supervision of Christ, the second Adam, after sin comes to an end, and the results of the fall are repaired. Christ refers to the introduction of this era of sinless and deathless perfection on earth, when glorified humanity will inherit a celestial kingdom, in these words: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit

the *kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25 : 31–34.) From this testimony we learn:

1. That the entrance of the saints into the kingdom is not at death, but "*when the Son of man shall come in his glory.*"

2. That the kingdom which they are to inherit is not heaven above, but the very "kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world," after the great separation takes place. Earth is to be renewed, sin to end, death cease, and God's glory to deluge the globe, for God has said, "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." But before the dawn of that age of glory, the statement of the apostle Peter must be verified: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto *fire* against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.... The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with a fervent heat.....Neverthless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. 3 : 7, 10, 13.) Here we have the "*judgment*," the "*fire*," and the "*perdition of ungodly men*" to *precede* the new earth state, "*wherein dwelleth righteousness.*" The "times of restitution" will unfold to our joyful vision the result of the announcement heard by the Revelator while describing the new earth state: "He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21 : 5), not all new things, but "all things new," agreeing with the Psalmist: "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. *They* shall *perish*, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou *change* them, and they shall *be changed.*" (Ps. 102 : 25, 26.) Thus the new earth is old earth "*changed*," or *made new;* and then "the tabernacle of God shall be with men,....and there shall be no more death: ....for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21 : 3, 4.) In this thrilling description of future bliss, we have the new Jerusalem coupled with the new earth, as the glorious capital of the world to come. No other home is due the saint of God, and this is not to be enjoyed till after the resurrection and judgment.

But I may be informed that Peter speaks of an inheritance "*reserved in heaven.*" So he does; but that which is "RESERVED IN HEAVEN" cannot be heaven itself, but something distinct

Has not God located reward subsequent to the judgment, without excepting any part of it? Then why should men decide that God's plan is *partly* wrong, while admitting that it is partly right? Rather "let God be true," not in part only, but fully true, even if immortal-soulism suffers in consequence, as it assuredly will; for the doctrine of reward before the judgment, in part or in full, either for saint or sinner, could never have come into existence independent of immortal-soulism—that great tree of theology which puts forth so many branches of error, loaded with evil fruit. Let the tree be hewn down, and these various branches of error will fall with it.

XIV. The doctrine of a *sky-kingdom* as the future home of the saints is another branch of error belonging to the same tree, originating from the impression that there is an embryo-angel within the saint, and that, when let out of its mortal prison-house, it will soar to the home of the angels on high. But the reader of the Bible is aware that God primarily created our world, and pronounced it not only "*good*," but "VERY GOOD," and that he placed a good man in it, on trial for endless life, with the "tree of life" before him, that at some time in his history, if faithful, he might "eat and live forever." Live *where?* In the very world God created on purpose for him to live in. If sin had never entered, this would have been the home of good men "forever;" and when sin is *removed*, and its results are overwhelmed in oblivion, this same realm will become the home of the good of every age, beyond the judgment-scene; and thus the original purpose of Jehovah in creating this globe will be carried out—earth will be peopled with a race of good men that will "*live forever*," in a Paradise that will bloom under the supervision of Christ, the second Adam, after sin comes to an end, and the results of the fall are repaired. Christ refers to the introduction of this era of sinless and deathless perfection on earth, when glorified humanity will inherit a celestial kingdom, in these words: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit

the *kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25 : 31–34.) From this testimony we learn:

1. That the entrance of the saints into the kingdom is not at death, but "*when the Son of man shall come in his glory.*"

2. That the kingdom which they are to inherit is not heaven above, but the very "kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world," after the great separation takes place. Earth is to be renewed, sin to end, death cease, and God's glory to deluge the globe, for God has said, "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." But before the dawn of that age of glory, the statement of the apostle Peter must be verified: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto *fire* against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.... The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with a fervent heat.....Neverthless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. 3 : 7, 10, 13.) Here we have the "*judgment*," the "*fire*," and the "*perdition of ungodly men*" to *precede* the new earth state, "*wherein dwelleth righteousness.*" The "times of restitution" will unfold to our joyful vision the result of the announcement heard by the Revelator while describing the new earth state: "He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21 : 5), not all new things, but "all things new," agreeing with the Psalmist: "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. *They* shall *perish*, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou *change* them, and they shall *be changed.*" (Ps. 102 : 25, 26.) Thus the new earth is old earth "*changed*," or *made new;* and then "the tabernacle of God shall be with men,....and there shall be no more death: ....for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21 : 3, 4.) In this thrilling description of future bliss, we have the new Jerusalem coupled with the new earth, as the glorious capital of the world to come. No other home is due the saint of God, and this is not to be enjoyed till after the resurrection and judgment.

But I may be informed that Peter speaks of an inheritance "*reserved in heaven.*" So he does; but that which is "RESERVED IN HEAVEN" cannot be heaven itself, but something distinct

therefrom; something *deposited* there; and instead of our *emigrating to heaven* to receive it, it is "*ready to be revealed in the last time.*" "Jerusalem which is above" is hereafter to come "down from God out of heaven;" then the saints, as real beings, will enter in through the gates into the city. Christ is coming, angels are coming, and the city is coming, and earth is to be cleansed from sin, and be filled with glory, and Christ is to reign, and the "tabernacle of God is to be with men," and saints are to be "equal to the angels," thus combining a world of glory with a world of *realities.* How much more delightful to contemplate than a world of shadows! Let me be a real being, in a real kingdom, under the supervision of the King of glory, rather than exist as a personal shadow, in a remote realm, peopled with the imaginary shades of the dead. Let me have real society, and be a real being forever.

While immortal-soulism exists, this long train of God-dishonoring errors will prevail. Without immortal-soulism, God could never have been dishonored with Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Necromancy, Transmigrationism, Hero-worship, Universalism, Endless torment, Spiritual resurrection, Spiritual advent, Rewards at death, and a Sky-kingdom for the saints.

To make war on these mighty errors, or on a part of them, while upholding the *only* platform on which they could possibly stand, is to act unwisely. All these great streams of bitter theology flow from one fountain. Shall we insist that the fountain is *sweet*, and still try to dry up the streams that flow from it? Can both sweet and bitter streams flow from the same fountain? And after seeing so many bitter streams flow out of this fountain, shall we persist in releasing the fountain from the charge of being a bitter fountain, on the mere supposition that it may send out some good streams? Not one good stream has ever been traced to this fountain—no, *not one;* nor can one of these bitter streams be traced to any other fountain. The only way to get rid of these miserable streams is to *dry up the fountain* from which they spring. The stroke that will kill immortal-soulism will also kill every one of these great errors, which have so long dishonored God, and cursed his cause. And so long as this system thrives, these errors will have a support. If you would get rid of a bad effect, ferret out the *cause*, and *remove* it. We have *found* the *cause*, the *true* cause, and the *only* cause of these great

errors. They all originate in immortal-soulism, and could not exist a moment without it. Shall we remove the cause, or shall we help keep alive these God-dishonoring errors by giving our sanction to the *cause* that produces these results? Shall we join hand in hand with the devil in proclaiming, "Ye shall not surely die?" If men really die, the resurrection is *needful;* but if death simply helps an immortal personality to escape from the mortal body, to live on, and live on endlessly, the doctrine of the resurrection is belittled; and as these doctrines cannot be reconciled, the resurrection is being rapidly discarded, by substituting in its stead a spiritual resurrection, which is only a blind method of denying the doctrine; but the blow that is dealt against a future *literal* resurrection of the saints will fall with equal force against the doctrine of Christ's resurrection in the past; and when that is blotted out, our hope is obliterated forever; "for if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain." (1 Cor. 15 : 16, 17.) The whole Christian system falls to the ground the moment we blot out Christ's resurrection, and that resurrection is blotted out by the same stroke that blots out our future literal resurrection, for his resurrection and ours are the same in kind, his being the first-fruits: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first-fruits* of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the *resurrection of the dead.*" (1 Cor. 15 : 20, 21.) As Christ is the resurrected *first-fruits*, and as he affirmed after his resurrection, "I am he that liveth, and *was dead*" (Rev. 1 : 18), thus proving his resurrection a literality, it follows that our resurrection must be like his; agreeing with Paul, "We look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change our vile body*, that it may be *fashioned* like unto his glorious BODY." (Phil. 3 : 20, 21.)

We have clearly discovered, in this brief examination of the subject, that there is a correct and an incorect theory of immortality. The correct theory is based upon Christ and the resurrection, attainable on conditions of obedience and faithfulness; while the incorrect theory is founded on immaterialism, independent of Christ, and regardless of character. Is not "the gift of God eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ?" (Rom. 6 : 23.) And has not every man eternal life who is immortal? In other words, can that which is immortal ever die? And if not, must it not live eternally? And can it be anything less

UMI

therefrom; something *deposited* there; and instead of our *emigrating to heaven* to receive it, it is "*ready to be revealed in the last time.*" "Jerusalem which is above" is hereafter to come "down from God out of heaven;" then the saints, as real beings, will enter in through the gates into the city. Christ is coming, angels are coming, and the city is coming, and earth is to be cleansed from sin, and be filled with glory, and Christ is to reign, and the "tabernacle of God is to be with men," and saints are to be "equal to the angels," thus combining a world of glory with a world of *realities.* How much more delightful to contemplate than a world of shadows! Let me be a real being, in a real kingdom, under the supervision of the King of glory, rather than exist as a personal shadow, in a remote realm, peopled with the imaginary shades of the dead. Let me have real society, and be a real being forever.

While immortal-soulism exists, this long train of God-dishonoring errors will prevail. Without immortal-soulism, God could never have been dishonored with Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Necromancy, Transmigrationism, Hero-worship, Universalism, Endless torment, Spiritual resurrection, Spiritual advent, Rewards at death, and a Sky-kingdom for the saints.

To make war on these mighty errors, or on a part of them, while upholding the *only* platform on which they could possibly stand, is to act unwisely. All these great streams of bitter theology flow from one fountain. Shall we insist that the fountain is *sweet*, and still try to dry up the streams that flow from it? Can both sweet and bitter streams flow from the same fountain? And after seeing so many bitter streams flow out of this fountain, shall we persist in releasing the fountain from the charge of being a bitter fountain, on the mere supposition that it may send out some good streams? Not one good stream has ever been traced to this fountain—no, *not one;* nor can one of these bitter streams be traced to any other fountain. The only way to get rid of these miserable streams is to *dry up the fountain* from which they spring. The stroke that will kill immortal-soulism will also kill every one of these great errors, which have so long dishonored God, and cursed his cause. And so long as this system thrives, these errors will have a support. If you would get rid of a bad effect, ferret out the *cause*, and *remove* it. We have *found* the *cause*, the *true* cause, and the *only* cause of these great

errors. They all originate in immortal-soulism, and could not exist a moment without it. Shall we remove the cause, or shall we help keep alive these God-dishonoring errors by giving our sanction to the *cause* that produces these results? Shall we join hand in hand with the devil in proclaiming, "Ye shall not surely die?" If men really die, the resurrection is *needful;* but if death simply helps an immortal personality to escape from the mortal body, to live on, and live on endlessly, the doctrine of the resurrection is belittled; and as these doctrines cannot be reconciled, the resurrection is being rapidly discarded, by substituting in its stead a spiritual resurrection, which is only a blind method of denying the doctrine; but the blow that is dealt against a future *literal* resurrection of the saints will fall with equal force against the doctrine of Christ's resurrection in the past; and when that is blotted out, our hope is obliterated forever; "for if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain." (1 Cor. 15 : 16, 17.) The whole Christian system falls to the ground the moment we blot out Christ's resurrection, and that resurrection is blotted out by the same stroke that blots out our future literal resurrection, for his resurrection and ours are the same in kind, his being the first-fruits: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first-fruits* of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the *resurrection of the dead.*" (1 Cor. 15 : 20, 21.) As Christ is the resurrected *first-fruits*, and as he affirmed after his resurrection, "I am he that liveth, and *was dead*" (Rev. 1 : 18), thus proving his resurrection a literality, it follows that our resurrection must be like his; agreeing with Paul, "We look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change our vile body*, that it may be *fashioned* like unto his glorious BODY." (Phil. 3 : 20, 21.)

We have clearly discovered, in this brief examination of the subject, that there is a correct and an incorect theory of immortality. The correct theory is based upon Christ and the resurrection, attainable on conditions of obedience and faithfulness; while the incorrect theory is founded on immaterialism, independent of Christ, and regardless of character. Is not "the gift of God eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ?" (Rom. 6 : 23.) And has not every man eternal life who is immortal? In other words, can that which is immortal ever die? And if not, must it not live eternally? And can it be anything less

UMI

than eternal life to live eternally? And if we already possess a nature that will require us to live eternally, whether we receive Christ or not, how can eternal life be the "*gift* of God" through Christ? And is not the commencement of eternal life at the *resurrection*, as the angel affirmed: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall *awake*, some to *everlasting life?*" (Dan. 12 : 2.) But I may be met with the claim that we are said to have eternal life in the *present tense*. So we are, in the same sense that the check-holder may be said to have a million of dollars, while every cent of it is in the bank for a stipulated time, to be given to him at the proper time, if the conditions are not forfeited. "And this is the record, that God *hath* given to us *eternal life*, and *this life* is in his Son." (1 John 5 : 11.) We have it now *prospectively*, but it is deposited "*in his Son*;" for Christ "*is our life*," "the resurrection and the *life*," in the sense of being the *Life-giver*. "And this is the *promise* that he hath *promised us*, even ETERNAL LIFE." (John 2 : 25.) And Christ adds: "In the *world to come* eternal life." (Mark 10 : 30.) Let immortality be given to the saint at the resurrection, and let *eternal life* then commence as the result, and then we can recognize it as the gift of God, through Christ, to the faithful only.

The Christian Church is even yet but very imperfectly freed from the unholy influence, and the mischievous operation of human authority. The house requires to be more carefully swept than it was at the reformation from Popery, and a more thorough search must be made for the old leaven, that it may be more completely cast out. Let all individual Christians, let all Christian Churches learn to act on *principle*, that in reference to Christian faith and duty, and worship, the question is not, How *thinkest* thou? but, "How *readest* thou?" Not, What is the use and wont? but, What is written in the Law? Not, How is it to be arranged by us? but, How has it been settled by our Master? Let us "seek out of the book of the Lord and read."—*Dr. Brown.*

It is generally conceded that by the expression, 'God breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul,' no more is meant than that God caused him to breathe, and he became a living soul. "Living soul" is applied to him in common with birds, beasts, and reptiles in the same chapter.—*C. Beecher.*

THE THRONE OF DAVID.

By ELD. FRANK BURR, New Rutland, Ill.

"Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." (Heb. 1 : 8.)

When sin entered this fair world, bringing its blight of desolation and ruin to the guilty pair and their offspring, in love and mercy to fallen man the Almighty enters, of his own free will, into covenant on his part for a restitution—a redemption, and proposes in that redemption and restitution to bring about and cause to exist such a state of affairs as shall please him, and be in harmony with his character. He covenants to produce a Redeemer who shall bruise the serpent's head. In hope and anticipation of this, Abel offers his lamb, and God's people present their bloody sacrifices on the altar of faith.

Again, he meets Abraham, and enters into covenant, promising unto the faithful ones a restituted earth, a heavenly country, a new heavens and earth, as their everlasting home.

Finally, he sends his prophet to Israel's king, to David, and makes known to him the perpetuity of his house and throne in that glorious heavenly land, where the death blight is gone forever, and immortality alone is found.

The subject of the restitution of David's throne and kingdom is vastly interesting to the human race, inasmuch as it is an embodiment of one of the three great promises of the gospel of God. It is intimately connected with the promise of eternal life; so much so that the apostle Paul offers it as a conclusive argument of the immortal resurrection of Christ, saying—"And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David." (Acts 13 : 34.) This seems to be a strange argument to prove the incorruptibility of Christ in his resurrection; nevertheless it is doubtless one of the strongest that could be offered. Let us investigate the record and note the connection. Turning to the 89th Psalm we read—"I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever;....for I have said Mercy shall be built up forever;....I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations."

than eternal life to live eternally? And if we already possess a nature that will require us to live eternally, whether we receive Christ or not, how can eternal life be the "*gift* of God" through Christ? And is not the commencement of eternal life at the *resurrection*, as the angel affirmed: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall *awake*, some to *everlasting life?*" (Dan. 12 : 2.) But I may be met with the claim that we are said to have eternal life in the *present tense*. So we are, in the same sense that the check-holder may be said to have a million of dollars, while every cent of it is in the bank for a stipulated time, to be given to him at the proper time, if the conditions are not forfeited. "And this is the record, that God *hath* given to us *eternal life*, and *this life* is in his Son." (1 John 5 : 11.) We have it now *prospectively*, but it is deposited "*in his Son*;" for Christ "*is our life*," "the resurrection and the *life*," in the sense of being the *Life-giver*. "And this is the *promise* that he hath *promised us*, even ETERNAL LIFE." (John 2 : 25.) And Christ adds: "In the *world to come* eternal life." (Mark 10 : 30.) Let immortality be given to the saint at the resurrection, and let *eternal life* then commence as the result, and then we can recognize it as the gift of God, through Christ, to the faithful only.

The Christian Church is even yet but very imperfectly freed from the unholy influence, and the mischievous operation of human authority. The house requires to be more carefully swept than it was at the reformation from Popery, and a more thorough search must be made for the old leaven, that it may be more completely cast out. Let all individual Christians, let all Christian Churches learn to act on *principle*, that in reference to Christian faith and duty, and worship, the question is not, How *thinkest* thou? but, "How *readest* thou?" Not, What is the use and wont? but, What is written in the Law? Not, How is it to be arranged by us? but, How has it been settled by our Master? Let us "seek out of the book of the Lord and read."—*Dr. Brown.*

It is generally conceded that by the expression, 'God breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul,' no more is meant than that God caused him to breathe, and he became a living soul. "Living soul" is applied to him in common with birds, beasts, and reptiles in the same chapter.—*C. Beecher.*

THE THRONE OF DAVID.

By ELD. FRANK BURR, New Rutland, Ill.

"Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." (Heb. 1 : 8.)

When sin entered this fair world, bringing its blight of desolation and ruin to the guilty pair and their offspring, in love and mercy to fallen man the Almighty enters, of his own free will, into covenant on his part for a restitution—a redemption, and proposes in that redemption and restitution to bring about and cause to exist such a state of affairs as shall please him, and be in harmony with his character. He covenants to produce a Redeemer who shall bruise the serpent's head. In hope and anticipation of this, Abel offers his lamb, and God's people present their bloody sacrifices on the altar of faith.

Again, he meets Abraham, and enters into covenant, promising unto the faithful ones a restituted earth, a heavenly country, a new heavens and earth, as their everlasting home.

Finally, he sends his prophet to Israel's king, to David, and makes known to him the perpetuity of his house and throne in that glorious heavenly land, where the death blight is gone forever, and immortality alone is found.

The subject of the restitution of David's throne and kingdom is vastly interesting to the human race, inasmuch as it is an embodiment of one of the three great promises of the gospel of God. It is intimately connected with the promise of eternal life; so much so that the apostle Paul offers it as a conclusive argument of the immortal resurrection of Christ, saying—"And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David." (Acts 13 : 34.) This seems to be a strange argument to prove the incorruptibility of Christ in his resurrection; nevertheless it is doubtless one of the strongest that could be offered. Let us investigate the record and note the connection. Turning to the 89th Psalm we read—"I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever;....for I have said Mercy shall be built up forever;....I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations."

Here everlasting mercy is coupled with the perpetuity of the seed of David and his throne. The covenant and oath here referred to may be found recorded in 2 Sam. 7: 12, 13. Farther on in the Psalm we find the covenant repeated in strong language. "My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven....My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me." (vv. 28, 29, 34, 36.)

We see by these quotations the intimate connection of the "sure mercies of David" with eternal life: for as the seed and throne of David are to be perpetuated forever, he who has the sure or everlasting mercy here promised must of necessity be immortal. But Christ is the one here meant by the "seed;" and so Paul wrote to Timothy: "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel." (2 Tim. 2: 8.) Also in writing his epistle to the Romans he says the gospel of God is "concerning Jesus Christ our Lord which was made of the seed of David." (Rom. 1: 3.) So also his lineage and genealogy are traced back by both Matthew and Luke to David.

But lest the perpetuity of the throne of David may be yet considered limited in time, the previous quotations being based on the term 'forever' for duration, which term is more frequently limited than otherwise, let us quote one or two passages which cannot be ambiguous. In Isaiah's prophecy we read: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder;....of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." (ch. 9: 6, 7.) Also we have the words of the angel to Mary saying: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David;....and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1: 32, 33.) Here we see the perpetuity of the throne is eternal, it having "*no end.*" Therefore the "seed" who shall occupy it must be made immortal, and thus be also without end of life.

DAVID'S THRONE IN HISTORY.

David succeeded Saul on the throne of Israel, being the chosen of God to establish Israel in peace. After the covenant is made with him concerning the eternal condition of his seed and throne, David "fell on sleep and saw corruption." "For David is not ascended into the heavens." (Acts 2: 34.) The city of David, the stronghold of Zion, had been taken from the Jebusites, and there David's throne was established: but the king whose strong arm had conquered all his foes and brought peace to Israel must now himself fall a victim to death. His voice which had so often tuned its notes to Israel's sweetest psalms is hushed in death. He has not gone up on high, but "is both dead and buried." (Acts 2: 29.) And thus he sleeps, waiting the sounding of the trump which shall awake the dead.

Solomon takes his place as ruler of Israel, and the kingdom passes on. Solomon passes away in death and his sons succeed him, but they are sinful rulers. Iniquity ripens fast until at last the crisis comes. Zedekiah sits upon the throne ruling perversely, when Ezekiel, sent by the Lord, thunders forth this prophetic word in his ears: "And thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown:....I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is: and I will give it him." (Ezek. 21: 25–27.)

Mark! he does not say it shall be overturned *forever;* but "*until*" a certain event; and that event is the coming of "him whose right it is," and that is only Christ; for he never forfeited it by disobedience as did Solomon and his successors. Christ has fulfilled all the conditions of the covenant as given in the 89th Psalm, and he is the only one of all David's seed of whom this can be said.

The words of the prophet were fulfilled. The diadem was removed, the crown was taken off, and Zedekiah taken captive by the king of Babylon, left the throne to be continually vacant or "no more" until the King of kings shall come and claim it as his own.

The prophet Micah, seeing the iniquity of the priests and judges in Jerusalem, speaks of the condition of the city during its desolation on this wise: "Therefore shall Zion for your sake

UMI

Here everlasting mercy is coupled with the perpetuity of the seed of David and his throne. The covenant and oath here referred to may be found recorded in 2 Sam. 7: 12, 13. Farther on in the Psalm we find the covenant repeated in strong language. "My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven....My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me." (vv. 28, 29, 34, 36.)

We see by these quotations the intimate connection of the "sure mercies of David" with eternal life: for as the seed and throne of David are to be perpetuated forever, he who has the sure or everlasting mercy here promised must of necessity be immortal. But Christ is the one here meant by the "seed;" and so Paul wrote to Timothy: "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel." (2 Tim. 2: 8.) Also in writing his epistle to the Romans he says the gospel of God is "concerning Jesus Christ our Lord which was made of the seed of David." (Rom. 1: 3.) So also his lineage and genealogy are traced back by both Matthew and Luke to David.

But lest the perpetuity of the throne of David may be yet considered limited in time, the previous quotations being based on the term 'forever' for duration, which term is more frequently limited than otherwise, let us quote one or two passages which cannot be ambiguous. In Isaiah's prophecy we read: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder;....of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." (ch. 9: 6, 7.) Also we have the words of the angel to Mary saying: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David;....and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1: 32, 33.) Here we see the perpetuity of the throne is eternal, it having "*no end.*" Therefore the "seed" who shall occupy it must be made immortal, and thus be also without end of life.

DAVID'S THRONE IN HISTORY.

David succeeded Saul on the throne of Israel, being the chosen of God to establish Israel in peace. After the covenant is made with him concerning the eternal condition of his seed and throne, David "fell on sleep and saw corruption." "For David is not ascended into the heavens." (Acts 2: 34.) The city of David, the stronghold of Zion, had been taken from the Jebusites, and there David's throne was established: but the king whose strong arm had conquered all his foes and brought peace to Israel must now himself fall a victim to death. His voice which had so often tuned its notes to Israel's sweetest psalms is hushed in death. He has not gone up on high, but "is both dead and buried." (Acts 2: 29.) And thus he sleeps, waiting the sounding of the trump which shall awake the dead.

Solomon takes his place as ruler of Israel, and the kingdom passes on. Solomon passes away in death and his sons succeed him, but they are sinful rulers. Iniquity ripens fast until at last the crisis comes. Zedekiah sits upon the throne ruling perversely, when Ezekiel, sent by the Lord, thunders forth this prophetic word in his ears: "And thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown:....I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is: and I will give it him." (Ezek. 21: 25–27.)

Mark! he does not say it shall be overturned *forever;* but "*until*" a certain event; and that event is the coming of "him whose right it is," and that is only Christ; for he never forfeited it by disobedience as did Solomon and his successors. Christ has fulfilled all the conditions of the covenant as given in the 89th Psalm, and he is the only one of all David's seed of whom this can be said.

The words of the prophet were fulfilled. The diadem was removed, the crown was taken off, and Zedekiah taken captive by the king of Babylon, left the throne to be continually vacant or "no more" until the King of kings shall come and claim it as his own.

The prophet Micah, seeing the iniquity of the priests and judges in Jerusalem, speaks of the condition of the city during its desolation on this wise: "Therefore shall Zion for your sake

UMI

be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest." (Mic. 3: 12.) Three facts are mentioned here, viz: the plowing of Mt. Zion as a field—the desolation of Jerusalem as a city—and Mt. Moriah where the temple stood, should be a place of idolatrous worship. Surely the occurence of these events would not aid in the restitution of David's throne, but rather add to its desolation. While these things exist, certainly the throne of empire can never find its seat in Zion. But the Psalmist says: "The Lord hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it. There will I make the horn of David to bud." (Ps. 132: 13, 14, 17.) Therefore it is quite evident that a change must come, from desolation and ruin to grandeur and glory. Has it come? We may go to-day and stand on that sacred spot within the walls of the "city of the Great King," and we still behold its ruin. Zion is still a field for the plowman's toil, while he annually rears his barley and rye. The city still presents its ruins of ancient walls and palaces to show its glory has departed, while on Moriah's mount, where stood the temple with its shechinal glory and the altar fires of God's ancient people, stands the Mosque of Omar with its domes and minarets glistening in the sun, an idolatrous shrine for the worship of the False Prophet.

Why should this be so now? How long must Jerusalem be thus desolate? When will its glory return and its desolation be ended? Hear the words of the Great Teacher: 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (Luke 21: 24.) Here is the word "until" again, marking a limit for the treading down, but that limit is only the closing of Gentile times or dominion, and closes with the same scenes that terminate the "until" in Ezekiel's prophecy, viz: the coming of him whose right it is to rule and reign. In harmony with this the early Christians promulgated the doctrine of Jerusalem's desolation until the end of Gentile rule. Julian, the apostate emperor of Rome, conceived the idea of restoring the Mosaic form of worship in Jerusalem, and thus proving Jesus a false prophet and impostor. Accordingly, in the year 363 he issued a call to all the Jews in his empire to assemble in their holy city and restore its former grandeur. The work commenced gloriously, but was suddenly relinquished, as historians relate, because of "horrible balls of fire, breaking out near the foundations, with frequent and reiterated attacks, which rendered the place from time to time inaccessible to the scorched and blasted workmen." (*Student's Gibbon*, p. 171.) Thus God's sacred word has been fulfilled, in spite of the efforts of kings and emperors to overthrow it, and bring it to naught.

On six different occasions has an apostate church sought to wrest the holy city from the Saracenic rule, and make it no more a desolation: but each crusade has been a signal failure, and the reason of Jerusalem's desolation to-day is simply because the "until" that alone can be the limit of the "treading down" has not yet transpired, and will not while Jesus remains above; "whom the heaven must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3: 21.)

DAVID'S THRONE RESTORED.

Thus far we have seen that for more than two thousand years the throne of David has been overturned, and yet God, who will not lie, has sworn that it shall be restored, and perpetuated eternally. We find the royal "seed," Christ, has been raised from the dead to immortality, but he does not yet occupy the throne of David. Instead of this we see him far away from earth, sitting on the right hand of God, according to the invitation given —"Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool." (Acts 2: 34.) Here another "until" marks a limitation of the time of his occupying the Almighty's throne. Therefore he cannot be occupying the throne of David *now*, as some teach, for he is to leave the throne he *now* occupies: but his occupancy of David's throne is to have "no end."

He says, himself, also: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." (Rev. 3: 21.) We see by this that he is not yet occupying his own throne, which is the throne of David. He refers to the *time* of his taking his own throne in one of his discourses, saying: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of *his* glory." (Matt. 25: 31.) Then all the periods limited by the word "until," the *overturning*, the *treading down*, the *sitting above*, shall expire, and he shall come to claim his throne.

UMI

be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest." (Mic. 3: 12.) Three facts are mentioned here, viz: the plowing of Mt. Zion as a field—the desolation of Jerusalem as a city—and Mt. Moriah where the temple stood, should be a place of idolatrous worship. Surely the occurence of these events would not aid in the restitution of David's throne, but rather add to its desolation. While these things exist, certainly the throne of empire can never find its seat in Zion. But the Psalmist says: "The Lord hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it. There will I make the horn of David to bud." (Ps. 132: 13, 14, 17.) Therefore it is quite evident that a change must come, from desolation and ruin to grandeur and glory. Has it come? We may go to-day and stand on that sacred spot within the walls of the "city of the Great King," and we still behold its ruin. Zion is still a field for the plowman's toil, while he annually rears his barley and rye. The city still presents its ruins of ancient walls and palaces to show its glory has departed, while on Moriah's mount, where stood the temple with its shechinal glory and the altar fires of God's ancient people, stands the Mosque of Omar with its domes and minarets glistening in the sun, an idolatrous shrine for the worship of the False Prophet.

Why should this be so now? How long must Jerusalem be thus desolate? When will its glory return and its desolation be ended? Hear the words of the Great Teacher: 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (Luke 21: 24.) Here is the word "until" again, marking a limit for the treading down, but that limit is only the closing of Gentile times or dominion, and closes with the same scenes that terminate the "until" in Ezekiel's prophecy, viz: the coming of him whose right it is to rule and reign. In harmony with this the early Christians promulgated the doctrine of Jerusalem's desolation until the end of Gentile rule. Julian, the apostate emperor of Rome, conceived the idea of restoring the Mosaic form of worship in Jerusalem, and thus proving Jesus a false prophet and impostor. Accordingly, in the year 363 he issued a call to all the Jews in his empire to assemble in their holy city and restore its former grandeur. The work commenced gloriously, but was suddenly relinquished, as historians relate, because of "horrible balls of fire, breaking out near the foundations, with frequent and reiterated attacks, which rendered the place from time to time inaccessible to the scorched and blasted workmen." (*Student's Gibbon*, p. 171.) Thus God's sacred word has been fulfilled, in spite of the efforts of kings and emperors to overthrow it, and bring it to naught.

On six different occasions has an apostate church sought to wrest the holy city from the Saracenic rule, and make it no more a desolation: but each crusade has been a signal failure, and the reason of Jerusalem's desolation to-day is simply because the "until" that alone can be the limit of the "treading down" has not yet transpired, and will not while Jesus remains above; "whom the heaven must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3: 21.)

DAVID'S THRONE RESTORED.

Thus far we have seen that for more than two thousand years the throne of David has been overturned, and yet God, who will not lie, has sworn that it shall be restored, and perpetuated eternally. We find the royal "seed," Christ, has been raised from the dead to immortality, but he does not yet occupy the throne of David. Instead of this we see him far away from earth, sitting on the right hand of God, according to the invitation given —"Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool." (Acts 2: 34.) Here another "until" marks a limitation of the time of his occupying the Almighty's throne. Therefore he cannot be occupying the throne of David *now*, as some teach, for he is to leave the throne he *now* occupies: but his occupancy of David's throne is to have "no end."

He says, himself, also: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." (Rev. 3: 21.) We see by this that he is not yet occupying his own throne, which is the throne of David. He refers to the *time* of his taking his own throne in one of his discourses, saying: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of *his* glory." (Matt. 25: 31.) Then all the periods limited by the word "until," the *overturning*, the *treading down*, the *sitting above*, shall expire, and he shall come to claim his throne.

UMI

Three things are to be noticed in this connection, viz: the *people*, the *throne*, and the *territory*. The people are the "house of Jacob." Jacob was a "supplanter" (Gen. 27: 36), and his name is used for Christ in Ps. 24: 6, and elsewhere. Jacob supplanted Esau, whose name, as Edom, signifies earthy; and in allegory, Esau is the temporal kingdom of mortal Israel, to be supplanted by Christ, the Jacob who inherits the blessing, and becomes the father of the house of Jacob, "whose house are we." (Heb. 3: 6.) Christ does not propose to reign over the house of Esau, or mortal Israel, but "as a son over his own house, whose house are we." (Heb. 3: 6.)

"All Israel shall be saved;" but "they are not all Israel who are of Israel," but "in Isaac shall thy seed be called:" and in another place it is written: "Now *we, brethren*, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." (Gal. 4: 28.) When the King comes he will speak and the dead shall hear his voice, and "his people shall be willing in the day of his power," and those sleeping in the dust of the earth shall awake and put on their beautiful garments of immortality, and ascend to meet their glorious King. All God's people changed to immortality will be glorified Israel, subject to Christ in his kingdom.

Then comes the glory of Zion and Jerusalem so long desolate and trodden down in the dust. "When the Lord shall build up Zion he shall appear in his glory." (Ps. 102: 16.) Then "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads." (Is. 35: 10.) Again: "Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed." (Is. 33: 20.) Thus will the Lord remember Zion as he has said, for the New Jerusalem shall come down in all its glory, and the "city of the Great King," "the tabernacle of God," shall be established forever, and the Throne of David shall no more be fallen; for, says the prophet, "in that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof." (Amos 9: 11.) The apostle James declares this prophecy to be for the purpose of saving "all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." (Acts 15: 17.) How beautifully does Isaiah speak of the coming glory to Zion in the fortieth, sixtieth, sixty-first, and sixty-second chapters of his prophecy.

Then shall the earth be renewed, purged from sin and pollution by the fires of judgment, and shall come forth a new earth, glorified and eternal, with Jesus sitting on the throne of David—

"There all ages to abide,"

while the eternally redeemed shall praise Zion's king forever and ever.

A groaning earth awaits the coming of her King. A groaning church await with longing hearts the glorious blissful day when her Deliverer shall appear—

"And place her enthroned at his side,
In glory that never shall end."

But "the Lord shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath." (Ps. 110: 5.) The Gentile nations shall be swept away like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor, forever gone, but the eternal kingdom shall never pass away. Let the glory come, let Zion be redeemed! is the cry of the saints: for unless the throne of David be restored, God's people have no hope that can ever be realized. Take away the restitution of David's throne in the future, and you take away the future glory, and kingdom, and salvation of God's people. But the word is pledged. God has sworn to accomplish it. "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." (Is. 9: 7.) Yes, the glory *shall come*. Gethsemane's groans and darkness shall pass away. Calvary shall no longer be a "place of skulls." Zion shall shine with the glorious light of the New Jerusalem, the city of our God.

"Hallelujah again,
Hallelujah amen!
Shout! for the work of redemption is done."

"COME QUICKLY!" This is the Church's hearty echo to Christ's promise, "Behold I come quickly." Come, Lord Jesus! Thus beats the pulse of the Church, thus the mystical body of Christ; and we should never be satisfied till we find such a spirit breathing in us, and causing us to look for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ. What comes from heaven in a promise, should be sent back to heaven in a prayer. Come, Lord Jesus, put an end to this state of sin, and sorrow, and temptation, and gather thy people out of this present evil world."—*Matthew Henry.*

UMI

Three things are to be noticed in this connection, viz: the *people*, the *throne*, and the *territory*. The people are the "house of Jacob." Jacob was a "supplanter" (Gen. 27: 36), and his name is used for Christ in Ps. 24: 6, and elsewhere. Jacob supplanted Esau, whose name, as Edom, signifies earthy; and in allegory, Esau is the temporal kingdom of mortal Israel, to be supplanted by Christ, the Jacob who inherits the blessing, and becomes the father of the house of Jacob, "whose house are we." (Heb. 3: 6.) Christ does not propose to reign over the house of Esau, or mortal Israel, but "as a son over his own house, whose house are we." (Heb. 3: 6.)

"All Israel shall be saved;" but "they are not all Israel who are of Israel," but "in Isaac shall thy seed be called:" and in another place it is written: "Now *we, brethren*, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." (Gal. 4: 28.) When the King comes he will speak and the dead shall hear his voice, and "his people shall be willing in the day of his power," and those sleeping in the dust of the earth shall awake and put on their beautiful garments of immortality, and ascend to meet their glorious King. All God's people changed to immortality will be glorified Israel, subject to Christ in his kingdom.

Then comes the glory of Zion and Jerusalem so long desolate and trodden down in the dust. "When the Lord shall build up Zion he shall appear in his glory." (Ps. 102: 16.) Then "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads." (Is. 35: 10.) Again: "Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed." (Is. 33: 20.) Thus will the Lord remember Zion as he has said, for the New Jerusalem shall come down in all its glory, and the "city of the Great King," "the tabernacle of God," shall be established forever, and the Throne of David shall no more be fallen; for, says the prophet, "in that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof." (Amos 9: 11.) The apostle James declares this prophecy to be for the purpose of saving "all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." (Acts 15: 17.) How beautifully does Isaiah speak of the coming glory to Zion in the fortieth, sixtieth, sixty-first, and sixty-second chapters of his prophecy.

Then shall the earth be renewed, purged from sin and pollution by the fires of judgment, and shall come forth a new earth, glorified and eternal, with Jesus sitting on the throne of David—

"There all ages to abide,"

while the eternally redeemed shall praise Zion's king forever and ever.

A groaning earth awaits the coming of her King. A groaning church await with longing hearts the glorious blissful day when her Deliverer shall appear—

"And place her enthroned at his side,
In glory that never shall end."

But "the Lord shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath." (Ps. 110: 5.) The Gentile nations shall be swept away like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor, forever gone, but the eternal kingdom shall never pass away. Let the glory come, let Zion be redeemed! is the cry of the saints: for unless the throne of David be restored, God's people have no hope that can ever be realized. Take away the restitution of David's throne in the future, and you take away the future glory, and kingdom, and salvation of God's people. But the word is pledged. God has sworn to accomplish it. "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." (Is. 9: 7.) Yes, the glory *shall come*. Gethsemane's groans and darkness shall pass away. Calvary shall no longer be a "place of skulls." Zion shall shine with the glorious light of the New Jerusalem, the city of our God.

"Hallelujah again,
Hallelujah amen!
Shout! for the work of redemption is done."

"COME QUICKLY!" This is the Church's hearty echo to Christ's promise, "Behold I come quickly." Come, Lord Jesus! Thus beats the pulse of the Church, thus the mystical body of Christ; and we should never be satisfied till we find such a spirit breathing in us, and causing us to look for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ. What comes from heaven in a promise, should be sent back to heaven in a prayer. Come, Lord Jesus, put an end to this state of sin, and sorrow, and temptation, and gather thy people out of this present evil world."—*Matthew Henry.*

UMI

A REVIEW OF PROF. BARTLETT'S

"REFUTATION OF THE THEORY OF ANNIHILATION."[1]

By HENRY CONSTABLE, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland.

This is a very learned, a very labored, a very able, and, we must add, a most futile effort to sustain a theory that is rapidly losing its hold upon the minds of thoughtful and truth-loving men both in America and Great Britain. We are very glad to have had our attention drawn to this work of Prof. Bartlett. We have for some years been engaged upon the great subject which it discusses. We have carefully read the controversy as it has been conducted in England, and ourselves aided, so far as lay in our power, toward its settlement. We have seen all that has been urged in England in defence of the Augustinian theory of the eternity of evil, and have readily turned to see what its advocates in America have been able to advance in its defence. For this purpose we have read with very great care Prof. Bartlett's work, which has been represented to us as the ablest that has appeared in the United States. We can readily believe it to be such. We can at all events only say that in our opinion it is very far superior to anything we have seen on the same side in the Old Country. We feel, after reading him, that the Professor of Chicago has said all that can be said, and said it well, for his side of the question. We also feel, after reading him, that his learning, his ingenuity, his great reasoning powers have not advanced a single argument that can stand calm and close examination. From our little island of Ireland, whose rugged shores are beaten by the wave of the ocean which stretches unbroken to his own great continent, we send to him, in no spirit of ill-will, our honest review of his work.

Before entering upon the regular argument of Prof. Bartlett we would make a few preliminary remarks which we consider to be called for, and which, we think, will help to the better understanding of this subject. We will first draw attention to the *title* which he and his fellow reasoners in general *insist* on attaching to the theory which affirms the eternal death and destruction of the ungodly in the future world. The only title he will allow it is that of "annihilation," and the use of this term he expressly tells us is "*indispensable*" *for his purposes.* (Pref., p. 5.) He will not, and he cannot, conduct the controversy without attaching this term to the theory of his opponents, whether they object to it or not. If he were to allow them without a protest to call their theory a theory of "destruction," he feels that he would be abandoning a vantage ground on which alone he can hope to fight the battle with success.

[1] *Life and Death Eternal: A Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation.* By Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Boston: American Tract Society. 1866.

Now why does Prof. Bartlett insist that the use of the term "annihilation" is "*indispensable*" for his argument? "Destruction" and "annihilation" are words very commonly used by the best English writers as words of the same meaning, and so the Professor himself acknowledges. (p. 368.) If any one doubts this, he need only consult Webster's Dictionary, which makes the two terms synonymous and interchangeable. Why then must the Professor deny that our theory is rightly called a theory of destruction, and insist that it must and ought to be called one of annihilation; *when annihilation and destruction mean the same thing?*

We can only imagine two reasons for the Professor's anxiety on this point. The first is this: The *word* "annihilation" does not occur in our English translation of the Bible. In another form it frequently does, as when Isaiah says of the enemies of Israel: "They that war against thee shall be *as nothing, and as a thing of naught*" (ch. 41: 12); for "annihilation" simply means bringing to nothing. *What it signifies* is affirmed of the ungodly in a thousand places of Scripture, wherever their *destruction* is spoken of. But the word itself is not in our translation. We can therefore readily suppose that the opponents of our theory prefer the use of a term which is not in the English version, and which may lead thoughtless minds to suppose that the theory is itself unscriptural. Does any consideration of this kind unconsciously influence Prof. Bartlett? We ask him of what little real service to his cause it can be to attach to our theory a term not found in the English version, when the thing intended by that term is conveyed by other terms over and over again?

If this is not the Professor's real reason, we can only imagine one other. Besides its sense of "disorganization," or "destruc-

UMI

A REVIEW OF PROF. BARTLETT'S

"REFUTATION OF THE THEORY OF ANNIHILATION."[1]

By HENRY CONSTABLE, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland.

This is a very learned, a very labored, a very able, and, we must add, a most futile effort to sustain a theory that is rapidly losing its hold upon the minds of thoughtful and truth-loving men both in America and Great Britain. We are very glad to have had our attention drawn to this work of Prof. Bartlett. We have for some years been engaged upon the great subject which it discusses. We have carefully read the controversy as it has been conducted in England, and ourselves aided, so far as lay in our power, toward its settlement. We have seen all that has been urged in England in defence of the Augustinian theory of the eternity of evil, and have readily turned to see what its advocates in America have been able to advance in its defence. For this purpose we have read with very great care Prof. Bartlett's work, which has been represented to us as the ablest that has appeared in the United States. We can readily believe it to be such. We can at all events only say that in our opinion it is very far superior to anything we have seen on the same side in the Old Country. We feel, after reading him, that the Professor of Chicago has said all that can be said, and said it well, for his side of the question. We also feel, after reading him, that his learning, his ingenuity, his great reasoning powers have not advanced a single argument that can stand calm and close examination. From our little island of Ireland, whose rugged shores are beaten by the wave of the ocean which stretches unbroken to his own great continent, we send to him, in no spirit of ill-will, our honest review of his work.

Before entering upon the regular argument of Prof. Bartlett we would make a few preliminary remarks which we consider to be called for, and which, we think, will help to the better understanding of this subject. We will first draw attention to the *title* which he and his fellow reasoners in general *insist* on attaching to the theory which affirms the eternal death and destruction of the ungodly in the future world. The only title he will allow it is that of "annihilation," and the use of this term he expressly tells us is "*indispensable*" *for his purposes.* (Pref., p. 5.) He will not, and he cannot, conduct the controversy without attaching this term to the theory of his opponents, whether they object to it or not. If he were to allow them without a protest to call their theory a theory of "destruction," he feels that he would be abandoning a vantage ground on which alone he can hope to fight the battle with success.

[1] *Life and Death Eternal: A Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation.* By Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Boston: American Tract Society. 1866.

Now why does Prof. Bartlett insist that the use of the term "annihilation" is "*indispensable*" for his argument? "Destruction" and "annihilation" are words very commonly used by the best English writers as words of the same meaning, and so the Professor himself acknowledges. (p. 368.) If any one doubts this, he need only consult Webster's Dictionary, which makes the two terms synonymous and interchangeable. Why then must the Professor deny that our theory is rightly called a theory of destruction, and insist that it must and ought to be called one of annihilation; *when annihilation and destruction mean the same thing?*

We can only imagine two reasons for the Professor's anxiety on this point. The first is this: The *word* "annihilation" does not occur in our English translation of the Bible. In another form it frequently does, as when Isaiah says of the enemies of Israel: "They that war against thee shall be *as nothing, and as a thing of naught*" (ch. 41: 12); for "annihilation" simply means bringing to nothing. *What it signifies* is affirmed of the ungodly in a thousand places of Scripture, wherever their *destruction* is spoken of. But the word itself is not in our translation. We can therefore readily suppose that the opponents of our theory prefer the use of a term which is not in the English version, and which may lead thoughtless minds to suppose that the theory is itself unscriptural. Does any consideration of this kind unconsciously influence Prof. Bartlett? We ask him of what little real service to his cause it can be to attach to our theory a term not found in the English version, when the thing intended by that term is conveyed by other terms over and over again?

If this is not the Professor's real reason, we can only imagine one other. Besides its sense of "disorganization," or "destruc-

UMI

tion," annihilation is very often used to express a process which modern philosophy, we believe, universally denies. It is the process of reducing matter to nothing, not simply of destroying the organization of a body, but of *reducing the parts themselves of which the body was composed to nothing.* Of this Bacon, and with him all philosophy, says: "*It is impossible* for any body to be utterly annihilated." Now we remark of Prof. Bartlett, that it is *in this sense* he constantly uses the term throughout his work. "*No matter,*" he tells us in one place, "*is annihilated:*" and in another place he quotes Abp. Whately as expressing his own views when he says—"It is equally impossible to annihilate the smallest as the largest quantity of matter." (pp. 38, 135.) He also repeatedly finds fault with his opponents for using "destruction" as an equivalent for "annihilation." (pp. 341, 369.) Now the effect produced on unthinking or ignorant persons by all this manipulation is *that there is no such thing possible as annihilation means.* To minds thus tutored and prepared our theory is proposed *as one of annihilation.* We are told that we may not, and ought not to call it a theory of destruction, but that annihilation is its only proper designation.

What is the conclusion which will be drawn from this artful handling of the subject? We do not say that Prof. Bartlett intends such a conclusion to be drawn, but we do say that such is the conclusion to which his mode of reasoning naturally leads. It is this, that we who hold that the ungodly will finally lose their being and existence are *teaching a doctrine of annihilation which philosophy denies to be possible.* Is it fair to enlist such a prejudice against us? Is it fair to create by this use of terms an impression of our views which is not a true one? For we do not hold the philosophical annihilation of matter any more than Prof. Bartlett. We do not know of a single thinker on our side who does. We challenge Prof. Bartlett to produce even one of us who does. We hold the final disorganization and destruction of the ungodly which even Prof. Bartlett is obliged (p. 368) to allow is the "popular" sense of "annihilation." Why then draw special attention to the word in its philosophic sense, concentrate the view on this as the proper sense, and then attach the term to our view as though this was its sense when it is not! Is it "*indispensable*" to give an untrue coloring to our theory in order to hold it up to public reprobation? Is it thus only it can be prevented from taking its place in the faith of Christians?

But if Prof. Bartlett says that he does not mean to represent us as holding a philosophical error, but that he only uses the term "annihilation" as applied to our view in its popular sense, then he must allow that our theory has just as good a right to be called a theory of "destruction" as one of "annihilation;" for, taken in the popular sense, "annihilation" and "destruction" are one and the same thing.

And now let us clear away the ground before we proceed to examine Prof. Bartlett's arguments. Let us see what is the *real question* between him and us. He has produced by his way of proceeding a great deal of obscurity which must be removed.

And in the first place he would lead his readers to suppose that *he was the upholder and we the deniers of a future life!* He ranks us with the Epicureans of Greece, the Sadducees of Judea, and the Revolutionists of France. (Pref., p. 6.) Is Prof. Bartlett serious in making such a charge? Does he know the opinions of those Epicureans and Sadducees which he confounds with ours? Is he not aware that they taught that there was *no future life* for mankind at all, and that the death which all here incur is, for *all alike* an eternal sleep? This is not our opinion, nor is it, so far as we know, the opinion of any writer on our side. We *all* hold a future and that an eternal life for the redeemed. For our part we hold a future life for the reprobate likewise, though, following our Lord's teaching, we do not hold it to be eternal. And yet Prof. Bartlett holds us up as holding the doctrine of the Sadducee and the Epicurean in their denial of a future life! Please to withdraw your assertion, Prof. Bartlett, for we abhor the leaven of the Sadducee as much as you do yourself.

Prof. Bartlett probably falls into this serious misrepresentation of us from confounding, as many writers on his side do, belief in a future life with belief in the inalienable immortality of man. The two are quite distinct. We will show this from one of those instances which he heaps up at random as though every believer in a future life was necessarily a believer in his theory of immortality. He brings forward the Buddhists in support of his view. (Pref., p. 6.) Now it is certainly the fact that the Buddhists do believe in a future life for all spirits after bodily death; but it is also a fact that they do *not* believe in the immortality of any spirit whatsoever; for they hold that after passing through many transmigrations they at last sink into nothingness and lose all

UMI

tion," annihilation is very often used to express a process which modern philosophy, we believe, universally denies. It is the process of reducing matter to nothing, not simply of destroying the organization of a body, but of *reducing the parts themselves of which the body was composed to nothing.* Of this Bacon, and with him all philosophy, says: "*It is impossible* for any body to be utterly annihilated." Now we remark of Prof. Bartlett, that it is *in this sense* he constantly uses the term throughout his work. "*No matter,*" he tells us in one place, "*is annihilated:*" and in another place he quotes Abp. Whately as expressing his own views when he says—"It is equally impossible to annihilate the smallest as the largest quantity of matter." (pp. 38, 135.) He also repeatedly finds fault with his opponents for using "destruction" as an equivalent for "annihilation." (pp. 341, 369.) Now the effect produced on unthinking or ignorant persons by all this manipulation is *that there is no such thing possible as annihilation means.* To minds thus tutored and prepared our theory is proposed *as one of annihilation.* We are told that we may not, and ought not to call it a theory of destruction, but that annihilation is its only proper designation.

What is the conclusion which will be drawn from this artful handling of the subject? We do not say that Prof. Bartlett intends such a conclusion to be drawn, but we do say that such is the conclusion to which his mode of reasoning naturally leads. It is this, that we who hold that the ungodly will finally lose their being and existence are *teaching a doctrine of annihilation which philosophy denies to be possible.* Is it fair to enlist such a prejudice against us? Is it fair to create by this use of terms an impression of our views which is not a true one? For we do not hold the philosophical annihilation of matter any more than Prof. Bartlett. We do not know of a single thinker on our side who does. We challenge Prof. Bartlett to produce even one of us who does. We hold the final disorganization and destruction of the ungodly which even Prof. Bartlett is obliged (p. 368) to allow is the "popular" sense of "annihilation." Why then draw special attention to the word in its philosophic sense, concentrate the view on this as the proper sense, and then attach the term to our view as though this was its sense when it is not! Is it "*indispensable*" to give an untrue coloring to our theory in order to hold it up to public reprobation? Is it thus only it can be prevented from taking its place in the faith of Christians?

But if Prof. Bartlett says that he does not mean to represent us as holding a philosophical error, but that he only uses the term "annihilation" as applied to our view in its popular sense, then he must allow that our theory has just as good a right to be called a theory of "destruction" as one of "annihilation;" for, taken in the popular sense, "annihilation" and "destruction" are one and the same thing.

And now let us clear away the ground before we proceed to examine Prof. Bartlett's arguments. Let us see what is the *real question* between him and us. He has produced by his way of proceeding a great deal of obscurity which must be removed.

And in the first place he would lead his readers to suppose that *he was the upholder and we the deniers of a future life!* He ranks us with the Epicureans of Greece, the Sadducees of Judea, and the Revolutionists of France. (Pref., p. 6.) Is Prof. Bartlett serious in making such a charge? Does he know the opinions of those Epicureans and Sadducees which he confounds with ours? Is he not aware that they taught that there was *no future life* for mankind at all, and that the death which all here incur is, for *all alike* an eternal sleep? This is not our opinion, nor is it, so far as we know, the opinion of any writer on our side. We *all* hold a future and that an eternal life for the redeemed. For our part we hold a future life for the reprobate likewise, though, following our Lord's teaching, we do not hold it to be eternal. And yet Prof. Bartlett holds us up as holding the doctrine of the Sadducee and the Epicurean in their denial of a future life! Please to withdraw your assertion, Prof. Bartlett, for we abhor the leaven of the Sadducee as much as you do yourself.

Prof. Bartlett probably falls into this serious misrepresentation of us from confounding, as many writers on his side do, belief in a future life with belief in the inalienable immortality of man. The two are quite distinct. We will show this from one of those instances which he heaps up at random as though every believer in a future life was necessarily a believer in his theory of immortality. He brings forward the Buddhists in support of his view. (Pref., p. 6.) Now it is certainly the fact that the Buddhists do believe in a future life for all spirits after bodily death; but it is also a fact that they do *not* believe in the immortality of any spirit whatsoever; for they hold that after passing through many transmigrations they at last sink into nothingness and lose all

UMI

personality. This is a common opinion with the Dyaks of Borneo also.[1] Prof. Bartlett had much better quote us, poor annihilationists, in support of his theory; for while we hold a future life for all, whether saved or lost, we hold that this future life will be an eternal one for the redeemed.

What then is the real difference between the Professor's theory and ours? It is this, and this only! *He holds the eternity of evil and misery, and we do not!* It is for *this* that he is contending. All that is good, happy, glorious, in the view of immortality, we hold and believe as our heritage in Jesus Christ. But all this he thinks nothing unless he can show side by side with this glorious future of the immortality of the redeemed an equal immortality of the lost. It is not for a future life he argues, it is not for a blessed immortality he reasons; it is wholly and solely for an eternity of evil, of blasphemy, of anguish, the very contemplation of which "confounds" and "appalls" his own mind when he summons up courage to gaze upon its "terrific" aspect! (p. 16.) Let our readers remember that *this* is the prize for which the Professor contends. It is not a future life—it is not a blessed immortality—*it is only an immortality of evil and woe.* We will not be misrepresented by him as denying the former: it gives us unutterable joy to be able, in obedience to God's Word, to reject the latter as the foulest slander upon God's character that Satan has ever succeeded in imposing upon the faith of man.

It is for the old Manichæan heresy of the eternity of evil, introduced in a new shape, that Prof. Bartlett and his fellow-laborers contend! And how is this "terrific" theory sought to be maintained by him?

One might fairly expect that he would boldly maintain *the justice* of his view—that he would tell us that a life of everlasting torment is the just award which not only sins of knowledge but also sins of ignorance committed by the creature in this short life deserve. In older times a defence of this as just used to be made. But Prof. Bartlett avoids this ground. He will not here contend. He knows that the infidel proclaims aloud that such a punishment is rank injustice: he knows that men who believe God's words as truly as he does proclaim the same: he knows that those who hold his view mourn and groan in spirit at its "terrific" appearance: but not one word will the Professor

[1] *Life in the Far East*, by S. St. John, vol. I., pp. 181-2.

utter to silence the taunts of opponents, to calm the uneasiness of friends. He knows that a punishment such as he asserts *appears* unjust in the eyes and the judgment of mankind. And what is his escape? He tells us we cannot now judge at all in this matter; *i. e.*, that throughout the whole of human existence, God's conduct *must appear unjust* in the eyes of his creatures. He does more than this: he tells us that at no future period shall either we or any creature however exalted be able to form any opinion on the subject, for that it "would *require a knowledge of God's whole being, resources, views, intentions,*" to be able to do so. (p. 19.) So that according to the Professor, *God's conduct will probably appear unjust in the eyes of all his creation throughout eternity;* for certainly a knowledge such as he speaks of above can be possessed by no creature whatsoever!

Such is the Professor's refuge! Do not, he tells us, dare to scan God's conduct—turn away your eyes from such unhallowed gaze—if you examine into what he does it must appear to you unjust—close your ears to those endless wailings—your eyes to those eternal agonies—your reason to why they are deserved and are essential—think of all this as a mere "*question of fact.*" (p. 19.) Ah, no, Prof. Bartlett, we cannot think of this question as a mere question of fact; as such a question as the hight of a mountain in the moon, as the distance of the sun from the earth. The character of our God is too dear to us for that. The eternal of our brothers and sisters is too solemn for treatment such as this. We must and will look *at the justice of the case. You make no defence, and therefore we conclude that no defence can be made.*

God does not appeal to us to judge his conduct (Ezek. 18: 29), and act in such a manner as must appear unjust in the eyes of every rational being who is invited to judge. The theory of eternal torments is dismissed on the merits of the case. The question is a great *moral* question, and moral considerations cannot be excluded.

And now let us calmly inquire into the grounds of a theory for which Mr. Bartlett cannot say one word on the score of justice—a theory which confounds and dismays its upholders, gives to the infidel his keenest weapon of offence, and violates every idea of justice conceivable by the human mind. It requires evidence of the very highest kind to establish an ordinary miracle, which is but a departure from the ordinary known laws of nature: most assuredly it will require evidence of a similar kind to es-

UMI

personality. This is a common opinion with the Dyaks of Borneo also.[1] Prof. Bartlett had much better quote us, poor annihilationists, in support of his theory; for while we hold a future life for all, whether saved or lost, we hold that this future life will be an eternal one for the redeemed.

What then is the real difference between the Professor's theory and ours? It is this, and this only! *He holds the eternity of evil and misery, and we do not!* It is for *this* that he is contending. All that is good, happy, glorious, in the view of immortality, we hold and believe as our heritage in Jesus Christ. But all this he thinks nothing unless he can show side by side with this glorious future of the immortality of the redeemed an equal immortality of the lost. It is not for a future life he argues, it is not for a blessed immortality he reasons; it is wholly and solely for an eternity of evil, of blasphemy, of anguish, the very contemplation of which "confounds" and "appalls" his own mind when he summons up courage to gaze upon its "terrific" aspect! (p. 16.) Let our readers remember that *this* is the prize for which the Professor contends. It is not a future life—it is not a blessed immortality—*it is only an immortality of evil and woe.* We will not be misrepresented by him as denying the former: it gives us unutterable joy to be able, in obedience to God's Word, to reject the latter as the foulest slander upon God's character that Satan has ever succeeded in imposing upon the faith of man.

It is for the old Manichæan heresy of the eternity of evil, introduced in a new shape, that Prof. Bartlett and his fellow-laborers contend! And how is this "terrific" theory sought to be maintained by him?

One might fairly expect that he would boldly maintain *the justice* of his view—that he would tell us that a life of everlasting torment is the just award which not only sins of knowledge but also sins of ignorance committed by the creature in this short life deserve. In older times a defence of this as just used to be made. But Prof. Bartlett avoids this ground. He will not here contend. He knows that the infidel proclaims aloud that such a punishment is rank injustice: he knows that men who believe God's words as truly as he does proclaim the same: he knows that those who hold his view mourn and groan in spirit at its "terrific" appearance: but not one word will the Professor

[1] *Life in the Far East*, by S. St. John, vol. I., pp. 181-2.

utter to silence the taunts of opponents, to calm the uneasiness of friends. He knows that a punishment such as he asserts *appears* unjust in the eyes and the judgment of mankind. And what is his escape? He tells us we cannot now judge at all in this matter; *i. e.*, that throughout the whole of human existence, God's conduct *must appear unjust* in the eyes of his creatures. He does more than this: he tells us that at no future period shall either we or any creature however exalted be able to form any opinion on the subject, for that it "would *require a knowledge of God's whole being, resources, views, intentions,*" to be able to do so. (p. 19.) So that according to the Professor, *God's conduct will probably appear unjust in the eyes of all his creation throughout eternity;* for certainly a knowledge such as he speaks of above can be possessed by no creature whatsoever!

Such is the Professor's refuge! Do not, he tells us, dare to scan God's conduct—turn away your eyes from such unhallowed gaze—if you examine into what he does it must appear to you unjust—close your ears to those endless wailings—your eyes to those eternal agonies—your reason to why they are deserved and are essential—think of all this as a mere "*question of fact.*" (p. 19.) Ah, no, Prof. Bartlett, we cannot think of this question as a mere question of fact; as such a question as the hight of a mountain in the moon, as the distance of the sun from the earth. The character of our God is too dear to us for that. The eternal of our brothers and sisters is too solemn for treatment such as this. We must and will look *at the justice of the case. You make no defence, and therefore we conclude that no defence can be made.*

God does not appeal to us to judge his conduct (Ezek. 18: 29), and act in such a manner as must appear unjust in the eyes of every rational being who is invited to judge. The theory of eternal torments is dismissed on the merits of the case. The question is a great *moral* question, and moral considerations cannot be excluded.

And now let us calmly inquire into the grounds of a theory for which Mr. Bartlett cannot say one word on the score of justice—a theory which confounds and dismays its upholders, gives to the infidel his keenest weapon of offence, and violates every idea of justice conceivable by the human mind. It requires evidence of the very highest kind to establish an ordinary miracle, which is but a departure from the ordinary known laws of nature: most assuredly it will require evidence of a similar kind to es-

UMI

tablish a theory such as this; which, to our minds, departs from every law of right and justice as established by God and agreed on by man.

Now when we come to inquire into the evidence advanced by Mr. Bartlett for his theory we will find it of the very poorest and most unsatisfactory kind. He ascertains (ch. 2) that language, including very many of, possibly all, the terms used in Scripture descriptive of future punishment, has *a primary* and *a secondary* meaning. For example, he tells us that while the primary sense of *death* is, as Webster defines it, "the cessation of all the vital functions, the extinction of bodily life," it has also a secondary meaning; and implies the *misery and moral disorganization* of a being who may be possessed of bodily life in full vigor. (pp. 38–41.) From this step he advances to another. The secondary or derived sense of language, as relates to the terms of future punishment and many other terms, he tells us has become, not only the "higher" and more "frequent" sense, but *also the sense in which such terms are most commonly used.* (p. 21.) Thus he teaches that while we may sometimes mean by "death" "the cessation of existence," this is by no means *its usual sense* either in common life or in those Holy Scriptures which he very correctly tells us "everwhere speak in the language of the people." (p. 23.) The ordinary meaning of "death" in common speech is, according to the Professor, misery and moral disorder. (p. 21.)

From this step Mr. Bartlett advances to a third. Having, as he supposes, established the secondary sense of the terms in question as their common and usual sense, he very naturally tells us that it is in this sense we ought to accept these terms when applied to the punishment of the wicked in the future life. Hence, according to him, whenever we are told in Scripture that after the judgment the wicked will "die" or suffer "death," we are not to take this expression in its primary sense as indicating the cessation of their existence, but are to take it in its secondary sense as indicating "*misery*," *or the deprivation of their "true functional action.*" (p. 41.) This latter, being, as he tells us, the usual sense of death in common life, and Scripture, and with "the best lexicographers," ought to be taken as its meaning when applied in Scripture to future punishment! Such is a brief and fair outline of Prof. Bartlett's argument in the first part of his work.

But he is not quite satisfied with it. Knowing well that, while the terms in question are admitted to have a secondary sense such as he puts upon them, it is wholly denied that such secondary sense is their common sense, or is admissible for one moment in their application to future punishment, he brings forward in the second part of his work a reason which is to compel us to take these terms in their secondary sense, no matter whether that be their common sense or not.

In common life we sometimes hear of a person, whom we see or otherwise *know to be possessed of bodily life*, exclaiming when overwhelmed with calamity that he has "perished," has been "destroyed," or is even "dead" while alive. Mr. Bartlett has given many instances of this; and they could be multiplied at pleasure a hundred or a thousand-fold. In cases of this kind we know, from our knowledge that the person is possessed of bodily life when he has uttered these wild exclamations, that the terms *cannot be taken in their primary meaning, but must be taken in their secondary sense.* Or, in Scripture, *persons, known to be possessed of bodily life and intellectual qualities in full exercise*, are spoken of as being, *at that very time, or at some previous period of their existence, dead, or dead in sins.* Here too we know, from our knowledge that the persons in question are possessed of physical life, and as such only are addressed at all, that the term "death" cannot be taken in its primary sense as indicating "the cessation of existence," but *must be taken in some secondary sense as indicating a great moral disorganization and loss of spiritual life.* In the same way Prof. Bartlett endeavors to show that the terms of future punishment cannot be taken in their primary, but must be taken in their secondary sense. His attempted proof is Plato's old theory—by Plato himself never accepted as really satisfactory—*of the inalienable immortality of all men whether good or bad.*

The wicked are immortal, according to Prof. Bartlett. As gifted with immortality, they never can, according to him, suffer a "cessation of existence." Hence all the terms descriptive of their future punishment *must needs* be taken in some secondary sense. It is no matter whether that be their common sense or not, it must *here* be their sense. As when Jeremiah in the dungeon (Lam. 3: 43, 53) exclaimed that men had "cut off his life," and that God had "slain" him (p. 30), we know that these strong expressions cannot mean the "cessation of Jeremiah's existence," *because we know that he was alive;* so when Scripture speaks of the

UMI

tablish a theory such as this; which, to our minds, departs from every law of right and justice as established by God and agreed on by man.

Now when we come to inquire into the evidence advanced by Mr. Bartlett for his theory we will find it of the very poorest and most unsatisfactory kind. He ascertains (ch. 2) that language, including very many of, possibly all, the terms used in Scripture descriptive of future punishment, has *a primary* and *a secondary* meaning. For example, he tells us that while the primary sense of *death* is, as Webster defines it, "the cessation of all the vital functions, the extinction of bodily life," it has also a secondary meaning; and implies the *misery and moral disorganization* of a being who may be possessed of bodily life in full vigor. (pp. 38–41.) From this step he advances to another. The secondary or derived sense of language, as relates to the terms of future punishment and many other terms, he tells us has become, not only the "higher" and more "frequent" sense, but *also the sense in which such terms are most commonly used.* (p. 21.) Thus he teaches that while we may sometimes mean by "death" "the cessation of existence," this is by no means *its usual sense* either in common life or in those Holy Scriptures which he very correctly tells us "everwhere speak in the language of the people." (p. 23.) The ordinary meaning of "death" in common speech is, according to the Professor, misery and moral disorder. (p. 21.)

From this step Mr. Bartlett advances to a third. Having, as he supposes, established the secondary sense of the terms in question as their common and usual sense, he very naturally tells us that it is in this sense we ought to accept these terms when applied to the punishment of the wicked in the future life. Hence, according to him, whenever we are told in Scripture that after the judgment the wicked will "die" or suffer "death," we are not to take this expression in its primary sense as indicating the cessation of their existence, but are to take it in its secondary sense as indicating "*misery*," *or the deprivation of their "true functional action.*" (p. 41.) This latter, being, as he tells us, the usual sense of death in common life, and Scripture, and with "the best lexicographers," ought to be taken as its meaning when applied in Scripture to future punishment! Such is a brief and fair outline of Prof. Bartlett's argument in the first part of his work.

But he is not quite satisfied with it. Knowing well that, while the terms in question are admitted to have a secondary sense such as he puts upon them, it is wholly denied that such secondary sense is their common sense, or is admissible for one moment in their application to future punishment, he brings forward in the second part of his work a reason which is to compel us to take these terms in their secondary sense, no matter whether that be their common sense or not.

In common life we sometimes hear of a person, whom we see or otherwise *know to be possessed of bodily life*, exclaiming when overwhelmed with calamity that he has "perished," has been "destroyed," or is even "dead" while alive. Mr. Bartlett has given many instances of this; and they could be multiplied at pleasure a hundred or a thousand-fold. In cases of this kind we know, from our knowledge that the person is possessed of bodily life when he has uttered these wild exclamations, that the terms *cannot be taken in their primary meaning, but must be taken in their secondary sense.* Or, in Scripture, *persons, known to be possessed of bodily life and intellectual qualities in full exercise*, are spoken of as being, *at that very time, or at some previous period of their existence, dead, or dead in sins.* Here too we know, from our knowledge that the persons in question are possessed of physical life, and as such only are addressed at all, that the term "death" cannot be taken in its primary sense as indicating "the cessation of existence," but *must be taken in some secondary sense as indicating a great moral disorganization and loss of spiritual life.* In the same way Prof. Bartlett endeavors to show that the terms of future punishment cannot be taken in their primary, but must be taken in their secondary sense. His attempted proof is Plato's old theory—by Plato himself never accepted as really satisfactory—*of the inalienable immortality of all men whether good or bad.*

The wicked are immortal, according to Prof. Bartlett. As gifted with immortality, they never can, according to him, suffer a "cessation of existence." Hence all the terms descriptive of their future punishment *must needs* be taken in some secondary sense. It is no matter whether that be their common sense or not, it must *here* be their sense. As when Jeremiah in the dungeon (Lam. 3: 43, 53) exclaimed that men had "cut off his life," and that God had "slain" him (p. 30), we know that these strong expressions cannot mean the "cessation of Jeremiah's existence," *because we know that he was alive;* so when Scripture speaks of the

UMI

wicked hereafter suffering death as a punishment, we are also to know that this cannot mean the "cessation of their existence," *because the wicked are immortal and therefore cannot cease to exist.* Such is Prof. Bartlett's famous "supplement" in his second book to his argument in the first. If the wicked were indeed immortal, it would form a powerful argument. If they are not immortal the argument is worth nothing. Plato may argue for their immortality, but God's word denies it; and therefore, Prof. Bartlett's learned researches into Egyptian mysteries, and Greek speculations, and Rabbinical traditions, are not worth the trouble he has taken. The Professor is only seeking to *establish a false law of lingual interpretation by a philosophical myth.*

We will now examine Prof. Bartlett's argument with somewhat more of detail, and show our readers its essential weakness. We will not dispute with him that the terms of future punishment have a primary and a secondary meaning, *or even that their secondary meaning is such as he gives.* We are here only addressing the English scholar, and arguing on the sense of the words of our English version. Were we arguing with a Greek scholar, acquainted with the original language of our Gospels and Epistles, we could take much higher ground. The Greek phrases for future punishment are much more numerous than our English version would lead us to suppose; and, while the Greek phrases have no doubt their primary and secondary meanings, often corresponding exactly with those of the English terms, *some* of the Greek terms have *no sense, primary or secondary*, that will admit of Mr. Bartlett's theory of future punishment. As the Professor is a Greek scholar, we are ready to meet *him* on this classical ground. But now only taking into account the terms of our English version, we will show our readers the utter futility of Mr. Bartlett's labored argument.

There are a great many terms in Scripture expressive of future punishment. It is described as "death," "destruction," "perdition," "loss of life," and so on. Of course we cannot enter upon an examination of all these phrases, else we should be writing a volume as lengthened as that on which we are now writing an article in a review. To bring our remarks within the necessary compass, and at the same time to give them the required fullness and clearness, we must confine our examination to *one* of the above terms, and we will take the important term of *death*.

Death, according to repeated passages of Scripture, is to be

the punishment of the wicked hereafter. Here there is no dispute. Our object is to ascertain its sense in Scripture *when it is thus applied*. Death has a primary and a secondary meaning. Here too there is no dispute. There shall be no dispute either as to what are its primary and secondary meanings, for we will take Prof. Bartlett's definitions *of* them. Accepting those definitions as sufficiently correct, we will join issue with him as to which is to be taken when future punishment is described.

The primary sense of death, then, according to Prof. Bartlett, is "*loss of* existence" or "physical death." (pp. 21, 47.) To this definition of his we will take the liberty to add the fuller, but perfectly harmonious definition of Webster, the great American authority on the sense of the English language. Death, then, according to Webster, is, in its primary sense, "that state of a being, animal or vegetable, but more particularly of an animal, in which there is *total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions*" Here we have the primary sense of the word "death" in the English, and, we may add, every language of the world. In this sense we maintain that the word is used when it is applied in Scripture to future punishment, and Mr. Bartlett allows that if it is thus used in Scripture, our view is right and his is wrong.

But death has a secondary sense also. We freely allow it, and have no objection to its having several secondary senses. We will now however confine ourselves to the secondary sense in which Mr. Bartlett uses it, and in which sense he maintains that it is to be taken when applied in Scripture to future punishment. Death then in this secondary sense is with Prof. Bartlett "the effect of sin," the absence or loss of "welfare, prosperity, happiness," "is that state of separation from God, and from the beatific vision of God, in which all the higher faculties of human nature are working falsely and discordantly; in which the true end of living is discarded, and its true enjoyment lost; and in which there is at last the complete extinction, not of the soul's being, but of its *well*-being." (pp. 38, 41, 46.) Death is "a moral or spiritual state of the soul," it designates "a moral wreck." (pp. 49, 50, 69.)

Now we have not the smallest objection to allowing that "death" is frequently taken in Scripture in this secondary sense. Mr. Bartlett need not have taken so much pains to prove it, for we really do not know of any one who denies it. He speaks of

wicked hereafter suffering death as a punishment, we are also to know that this cannot mean the "cessation of their existence," *because the wicked are immortal and therefore cannot cease to exist.* Such is Prof. Bartlett's famous "supplement" in his second book to his argument in the first. If the wicked were indeed immortal, it would form a powerful argument. If they are not immortal the argument is worth nothing. Plato may argue for their immortality, but God's word denies it; and therefore, Prof. Bartlett's learned researches into Egyptian mysteries, and Greek speculations, and Rabbinical traditions, are not worth the trouble he has taken. The Professor is only seeking to *establish a false law of lingual interpretation by a philosophical myth.*

We will now examine Prof. Bartlett's argument with somewhat more of detail, and show our readers its essential weakness. We will not dispute with him that the terms of future punishment have a primary and a secondary meaning, *or even that their secondary meaning is such as he gives.* We are here only addressing the English scholar, and arguing on the sense of the words of our English version. Were we arguing with a Greek scholar, acquainted with the original language of our Gospels and Epistles, we could take much higher ground. The Greek phrases for future punishment are much more numerous than our English version would lead us to suppose; and, while the Greek phrases have no doubt their primary and secondary meanings, often corresponding exactly with those of the English terms, *some* of the Greek terms have *no sense, primary or secondary*, that will admit of Mr. Bartlett's theory of future punishment. As the Professor is a Greek scholar, we are ready to meet *him* on this classical ground. But now only taking into account the terms of our English version, we will show our readers the utter futility of Mr. Bartlett's labored argument.

There are a great many terms in Scripture expressive of future punishment. It is described as "death," "destruction," "perdition," "loss of life," and so on. Of course we cannot enter upon an examination of all these phrases, else we should be writing a volume as lengthened as that on which we are now writing an article in a review. To bring our remarks within the necessary compass, and at the same time to give them the required fullness and clearness, we must confine our examination to *one* of the above terms, and we will take the important term of *death*.

Death, according to repeated passages of Scripture, is to be

the punishment of the wicked hereafter. Here there is no dispute. Our object is to ascertain its sense in Scripture *when it is thus applied*. Death has a primary and a secondary meaning. Here too there is no dispute. There shall be no dispute either as to what are its primary and secondary meanings, for we will take Prof. Bartlett's definitions *of* them. Accepting those definitions as sufficiently correct, we will join issue with him as to which is to be taken when future punishment is described.

The primary sense of death, then, according to Prof. Bartlett, is "*loss of* existence" or "physical death." (pp. 21, 47.) To this definition of his we will take the liberty to add the fuller, but perfectly harmonious definition of Webster, the great American authority on the sense of the English language. Death, then, according to Webster, is, in its primary sense, "that state of a being, animal or vegetable, but more particularly of an animal, in which there is *total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions*" Here we have the primary sense of the word "death" in the English, and, we may add, every language of the world. In this sense we maintain that the word is used when it is applied in Scripture to future punishment, and Mr. Bartlett allows that if it is thus used in Scripture, our view is right and his is wrong.

But death has a secondary sense also. We freely allow it, and have no objection to its having several secondary senses. We will now however confine ourselves to the secondary sense in which Mr. Bartlett uses it, and in which sense he maintains that it is to be taken when applied in Scripture to future punishment. Death then in this secondary sense is with Prof. Bartlett "the effect of sin," the absence or loss of "welfare, prosperity, happiness," "is that state of separation from God, and from the beatific vision of God, in which all the higher faculties of human nature are working falsely and discordantly; in which the true end of living is discarded, and its true enjoyment lost; and in which there is at last the complete extinction, not of the soul's being, but of its *well*-being." (pp. 38, 41, 46.) Death is "a moral or spiritual state of the soul," it designates "a moral wreck." (pp. 49, 50, 69.)

Now we have not the smallest objection to allowing that "death" is frequently taken in Scripture in this secondary sense. Mr. Bartlett need not have taken so much pains to prove it, for we really do not know of any one who denies it. He speaks of

the state of the unregenerate man before he is quickened by the Spirit of God, and which Paul describes in a few words—"dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. 2: 1.) In such men there is, while they are possessed of physical life, spiritual death, or "the total cessation" of spiritual life; *i. e.*, of faith in and love for God. We do not object in the least to the Professor's definition of "death:" we only object to its application. *This death*, he tells us, is the second death, is God's punishment hereafter for sin, is what shall be inflicted in the future retribution upon sinners in its "matured and perfected" stage. (p. 46.) Hell, with him, is but the continuation and carrying out and completing of the process here begun, the making the "moral wreck" a more completely moral wreck than it is now. It is making the "higher faculties of human nature" to work yet more "falsely and discordantly" than they have ever worked: to cause the "true end of life" to be "discarded" more utterly than it has ever been discarded by the vilest of sinners, and so to cause the "true enjoyment" of life to be more utterly "lost," and the "soul's well-being" to be more miserably cast away than it has ever here been done. Hell, in a word, is God's institution for intensifying and increasing throughout eternity the moral evil and misery which sin has introduced.

We would almost think that the mere description in plain language of Prof. Bartlett's horrible theory would be sufficient to refute it. However, we will present our readers with his reasons for accepting it, and our reasons for rejecting it as resting on the abuse of human language, as contradicting the plainest testimony of Scripture, and as throwing a slander upon the character of God of as deep and foul a nature as it is possible to conceive. Of all such *intention* we fully acquit Prof. Bartlett, but that his theory has such an effect we will show.

We would first draw our reader's attention to the great *similarity of argument* used for the Augustinian theory of endless life in misery and for Origen's theory of universal restoration. One main basis of the theory of each is the *inalienable immortality of all men.* The other main basis of each is *the use of the terms of Scripture descriptive of future punishment in a secondary sense.* Thus the second death in hell is with the former *a death in sin* producing evil and misery, while it is with the latter *a death to sin* producing holiness and happiness. Both theories discard the primary sense of the term "death" and similar

terms as fatal to them, and insist upon using them in some secondary meaning. We really cannot see why the Universalist has not as good a right for his use of the term as the Augustinian has for his. But now for the Professor's proof of his main position.

He begins, like a skillful rhetorician, with endeavoring to create *a prejudice* in favor of his view and against that of his opponents. The primary and original sense of the words, he tells us, is "low," "narrow," "sensual," "sensuous," "materializing," "*gross*," "*degrading.*" The secondary sense of the words on the contrary, he tells us, is "figurative," "metaphorical," "spiritual," "metaphysical," "higher," "deeper," "pregnant." (pp. 21–26.) He uses in fact so many captivating expressions to describe the secondary sense of the words, and so many depreciating terms to describe their primary sense, that we feel quite ashamed of this poor primary sense until we begin to think that language was in its origin the gift of God to man; that the primary sense was therefore the sense which God put upon words; that the secondary sense was afterwards developed or created by man, and that therefore it is scarcely becoming in us to speak of the primary sense of language in the "low" and "degrading" way that Mr. Bartlett does. We think that we may use language either in a primary or a secondary sense without using it in a "low" or "degrading" sense in either application, and that the only real degradation of language is the *improper use of it*, such as we maintain Prof. Bartlett has made throughout his learned work from beginning to end, where he tries to force upon the terms of future punishment a secondary meaning which they were never intended to bear.

But he tells us they *were* intended to bear this secondary meaning. What is his proof? He tells us that the secondary use of the terms in question is their "common use, and the clear Scripture use of the terms," and that it is so "by the agreement of the best lexicographers." (pp. 21, 41.) Well, here we come to plain ground, which we are always glad to do. We meet Mr. Bartlett's assertion with a flat denial. We say that the *primary use of the terms is their common use both in ordinary life and in Scripture, and that their secondary use is their uncommon and exceptional use.* For proof of our assertion we will not laboriously collect three or four hundred instances, or three or four thousand instances which with more trouble we could readily do, where

UMI

the state of the unregenerate man before he is quickened by the Spirit of God, and which Paul describes in a few words—"dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. 2: 1.) In such men there is, while they are possessed of physical life, spiritual death, or "the total cessation" of spiritual life; *i. e.*, of faith in and love for God. We do not object in the least to the Professor's definition of "death:" we only object to its application. *This death*, he tells us, is the second death, is God's punishment hereafter for sin, is what shall be inflicted in the future retribution upon sinners in its "matured and perfected" stage. (p. 46.) Hell, with him, is but the continuation and carrying out and completing of the process here begun, the making the "moral wreck" a more completely moral wreck than it is now. It is making the "higher faculties of human nature" to work yet more "falsely and discordantly" than they have ever worked: to cause the "true end of life" to be "discarded" more utterly than it has ever been discarded by the vilest of sinners, and so to cause the "true enjoyment" of life to be more utterly "lost," and the "soul's well-being" to be more miserably cast away than it has ever here been done. Hell, in a word, is God's institution for intensifying and increasing throughout eternity the moral evil and misery which sin has introduced.

We would almost think that the mere description in plain language of Prof. Bartlett's horrible theory would be sufficient to refute it. However, we will present our readers with his reasons for accepting it, and our reasons for rejecting it as resting on the abuse of human language, as contradicting the plainest testimony of Scripture, and as throwing a slander upon the character of God of as deep and foul a nature as it is possible to conceive. Of all such *intention* we fully acquit Prof. Bartlett, but that his theory has such an effect we will show.

We would first draw our reader's attention to the great *similarity of argument* used for the Augustinian theory of endless life in misery and for Origen's theory of universal restoration. One main basis of the theory of each is the *inalienable immortality of all men.* The other main basis of each is *the use of the terms of Scripture descriptive of future punishment in a secondary sense.* Thus the second death in hell is with the former *a death in sin* producing evil and misery, while it is with the latter *a death to sin* producing holiness and happiness. Both theories discard the primary sense of the term "death" and similar

terms as fatal to them, and insist upon using them in some secondary meaning. We really cannot see why the Universalist has not as good a right for his use of the term as the Augustinian has for his. But now for the Professor's proof of his main position.

He begins, like a skillful rhetorician, with endeavoring to create *a prejudice* in favor of his view and against that of his opponents. The primary and original sense of the words, he tells us, is "low," "narrow," "sensual," "sensuous," "materializing," "*gross*," "*degrading.*" The secondary sense of the words on the contrary, he tells us, is "figurative," "metaphorical," "spiritual," "metaphysical," "higher," "deeper," "pregnant." (pp. 21–26.) He uses in fact so many captivating expressions to describe the secondary sense of the words, and so many depreciating terms to describe their primary sense, that we feel quite ashamed of this poor primary sense until we begin to think that language was in its origin the gift of God to man; that the primary sense was therefore the sense which God put upon words; that the secondary sense was afterwards developed or created by man, and that therefore it is scarcely becoming in us to speak of the primary sense of language in the "low" and "degrading" way that Mr. Bartlett does. We think that we may use language either in a primary or a secondary sense without using it in a "low" or "degrading" sense in either application, and that the only real degradation of language is the *improper use of it*, such as we maintain Prof. Bartlett has made throughout his learned work from beginning to end, where he tries to force upon the terms of future punishment a secondary meaning which they were never intended to bear.

But he tells us they *were* intended to bear this secondary meaning. What is his proof? He tells us that the secondary use of the terms in question is their "common use, and the clear Scripture use of the terms," and that it is so "by the agreement of the best lexicographers." (pp. 21, 41.) Well, here we come to plain ground, which we are always glad to do. We meet Mr. Bartlett's assertion with a flat denial. We say that the *primary use of the terms is their common use both in ordinary life and in Scripture, and that their secondary use is their uncommon and exceptional use.* For proof of our assertion we will not laboriously collect three or four hundred instances, or three or four thousand instances which with more trouble we could readily do, where

UMI

the terms are used in their primary sense, and parade this immense assemblage of phrases before the bewildered eyes of our readers as a triumphant proof of our position. This is what Prof. Bartlett has done. He has ransacked Scripture and common literature for instances where the terms are taken in their secondary sense, and has brought forward a very formidable looking array. He might have filled his volume with similar instances extracted from the libraries of the world without advancing a single step in proof of his position. His array of phrases may dazzle ignorant readers, but they can deceive no one else.

When we want to know the common use of a word our simple reference is to those "best lexicographers" whom Mr. Bartlett claims for himself, but whom we will quote against him. These are men who have made words their study, and have in their dictionaries given us the result of such study, and it is our part to open their dictionaries when we want to know the various meanings of words, and which are their common and which their unusual significations. Why is it that Mr. Bartlett, who has evidently closely studied Webster's Dictionary, and who more than once claims Webster on his side, has never, so far as we remember, quoted Webster? Webster is an American author, now the first authority for the grand language which seems destined to become the language of the world; and yet we do not recollect that Mr. Bartlett has ever quoted his senses of the terms in question; which would have saved the Professor an immensity of trouble! What he has not done we will do. We are thus precluded from displaying any little knowledge we may have of English literature, but we are satisfied that we are taking a much better method of satisfying the English reader. We confine ourselves, solely for the sake of brevity, to the phrase "death."

We will thank our readers to open the last edition of Webster's Dictionary of the English language, if they have it: if not, they must take our word for what we say. Mr. Bartlett will be able, and doubtless willing, to correct us if we are wrong. Well, then, we will tell our readers that among the *seven different meanings* which Webster attaches to the word "death," *that meaning which Mr. Bartlett attaches to it and tells us is its common meaning is not found at all.* It is only in a note appended in small type where he gives the meaning of phrases connected with

death that he gives Mr. Bartlett's sense of the word, and *in that note he confines this use of it to Scripture!* On the authority of Webster, then, we tell our readers that the meaning attached by Mr. Bartlett to "death," and by him stated to be its common sense, *is a sense nearly unknown to the English language.* This point settles the Professor's references to other authorities.

"The Scriptures," he very properly tells us, "everywhere speak in the language of the people," and Webster, we suppose, represents "the best lexicographers." (pp. 23, 41.) But if any doubt as to the usage of Scripture still lurks in any one's mind, we would only ask such to open Cruden's Concordance to the Bible, or any similar book, at this word "death," and take the first ten or the first hundred references in it and see in how many the word is used in its primary, and in how many it is used in Mr. Bartlett's secondary sense. We venture at a guess to say that the proportion of the latter to the former will not be one in twenty. Prof. Bartlett, how can you call your secondary sense of "death" its common sense?

We freely allow that there are whole classes of passages where this and similar terms are to be taken in their secondary meaning. But we also say that in all such passages abundant proof is given to the most cursory reader that the terms are, and must be, and can only be, taken in a secondary meaning. We chiefly find the secondary sense in such circumstances as these. Some person *well known to be in possession of physical life*, applies to himself, or has applied to him by others, terms drawn from the loss of physical life in order to describe in the strongest phraseology the apparently hopeless condition in which he is placed. *His being well-known to be alive at the time he is thus spoken of is the reader's safeguard against any misinterpretation of the terms.* Thus Job exclaims that he is "broken," "destroyed," "poured out," "slain," "torn," that his "days are extinct:" but then we know all the time that his *life* was not allowed to be hurt (ch. 2: 6), and that therefore the primary sense of these words is *here* inadmissable. Again, Jeremiah exclaims that his "bones are broken," that he is "pulled in pieces," that he is "slain," "destroyed," "his life cut off:" but then we are expressly told that he was a living man at the time, and *therefore* we know that we are not to take these strong expressions in their primary signification. Or, *the very phrase itself* shows us that we are not to take it in its primary and common sense. Thus when we are told of people

the terms are used in their primary sense, and parade this immense assemblage of phrases before the bewildered eyes of our readers as a triumphant proof of our position. This is what Prof. Bartlett has done. He has ransacked Scripture and common literature for instances where the terms are taken in their secondary sense, and has brought forward a very formidable looking array. He might have filled his volume with similar instances extracted from the libraries of the world without advancing a single step in proof of his position. His array of phrases may dazzle ignorant readers, but they can deceive no one else.

When we want to know the common use of a word our simple reference is to those "best lexicographers" whom Mr. Bartlett claims for himself, but whom we will quote against him. These are men who have made words their study, and have in their dictionaries given us the result of such study, and it is our part to open their dictionaries when we want to know the various meanings of words, and which are their common and which their unusual significations. Why is it that Mr. Bartlett, who has evidently closely studied Webster's Dictionary, and who more than once claims Webster on his side, has never, so far as we remember, quoted Webster? Webster is an American author, now the first authority for the grand language which seems destined to become the language of the world; and yet we do not recollect that Mr. Bartlett has ever quoted his senses of the terms in question; which would have saved the Professor an immensity of trouble! What he has not done we will do. We are thus precluded from displaying any little knowledge we may have of English literature, but we are satisfied that we are taking a much better method of satisfying the English reader. We confine ourselves, solely for the sake of brevity, to the phrase "death."

We will thank our readers to open the last edition of Webster's Dictionary of the English language, if they have it: if not, they must take our word for what we say. Mr. Bartlett will be able, and doubtless willing, to correct us if we are wrong. Well, then, we will tell our readers that among the *seven different meanings* which Webster attaches to the word "death," *that meaning which Mr. Bartlett attaches to it and tells us is its common meaning is not found at all.* It is only in a note appended in small type where he gives the meaning of phrases connected with

death that he gives Mr. Bartlett's sense of the word, and *in that note he confines this use of it to Scripture!* On the authority of Webster, then, we tell our readers that the meaning attached by Mr. Bartlett to "death," and by him stated to be its common sense, *is a sense nearly unknown to the English language.* This point settles the Professor's references to other authorities.

"The Scriptures," he very properly tells us, "everywhere speak in the language of the people," and Webster, we suppose, represents "the best lexicographers." (pp. 23, 41.) But if any doubt as to the usage of Scripture still lurks in any one's mind, we would only ask such to open Cruden's Concordance to the Bible, or any similar book, at this word "death," and take the first ten or the first hundred references in it and see in how many the word is used in its primary, and in how many it is used in Mr. Bartlett's secondary sense. We venture at a guess to say that the proportion of the latter to the former will not be one in twenty. Prof. Bartlett, how can you call your secondary sense of "death" its common sense?

We freely allow that there are whole classes of passages where this and similar terms are to be taken in their secondary meaning. But we also say that in all such passages abundant proof is given to the most cursory reader that the terms are, and must be, and can only be, taken in a secondary meaning. We chiefly find the secondary sense in such circumstances as these. Some person *well known to be in possession of physical life*, applies to himself, or has applied to him by others, terms drawn from the loss of physical life in order to describe in the strongest phraseology the apparently hopeless condition in which he is placed. *His being well-known to be alive at the time he is thus spoken of is the reader's safeguard against any misinterpretation of the terms.* Thus Job exclaims that he is "broken," "destroyed," "poured out," "slain," "torn," that his "days are extinct:" but then we know all the time that his *life* was not allowed to be hurt (ch. 2: 6), and that therefore the primary sense of these words is *here* inadmissable. Again, Jeremiah exclaims that his "bones are broken," that he is "pulled in pieces," that he is "slain," "destroyed," "his life cut off:" but then we are expressly told that he was a living man at the time, and *therefore* we know that we are not to take these strong expressions in their primary signification. Or, *the very phrase itself* shows us that we are not to take it in its primary and common sense. Thus when we are told of people

"broken with *words*," "broken with *sorrow*," "lacerated with *grief*," "melted with *emotion*," "drowned in *sorrow*," we see as a matter of course that the various phrases are not to be taken in their ordinary meaning. Neither "words" nor "sorrow" literally break a man's bones: nor does "grief" lacerate his body as a tiger or a lion does: nor does "emotion" possess the liquefying power of fire: nor is "sorrow" the water either of land or sea; and, therefore, we know that we are not to take the terms in their primary sense. But under other and ordinary circumstances these and similar terms as a matter of course take their primary and ordinary meaning.

There are whole classes of documents, such as all directly or indirectly connected with law and jurisprudence, where this secondary sense is wholly inadmissible. If we heard a criminal condemned by a judge to death gravely pleading that his physical existence should not be taken from him because he had understood the legal penalty of "death" in a secondary sense, it is quite possible that he might be saved from the scaffold and the hangman; but it would only be by his being sent to a Lunatic Asylum as an incurable madman. That God's jurisprudence should be interpreted in a similar way, his awful penalty of sin explained by the tropes of poetry and the hyperbole of grief, is an outrage even of a graver kind because mixed up with a higher destiny and the Great Judge of the universe. *Yet such is "Prof. Bartlett's commentary upon the laws of God!"*

Shall we answer Mr. Bartlett out of his own mouth? Shall we show from his own words that he feels and knows right well that all his labored argument is mere special pleading, and that the edifice he has built up with so much pains is but a child's house of cards which a breath can blow down? Shall we bring him forward incautiously confessing that that primary sense of the word "death" which he has stigmatized as "low" and "sensual," and has affected to all but obliterate from "common use, and Scripture, and the best lexicographers," is its "*explicit*" and "*unambiguous*" *sense when applied to future punishment?* We will.

At p. 386 he is quoting from the book of Enoch an account of future punishment. Of "sinners ripened in guilt," this apocryphal writer tells us: "They shall be with the wicked, and like them, but *their souls shall not be put to death* in the day of judgment, nor shall they come out from hence." Mr. Bartlett's pithy and excellent comment on this description of the genuine Augustinian doctrine of the eternal life of misery of the lost is—"*there is no ambiguity here.*" About what does he allow that there is no ambiguity? Upon the sense of the word "death." In what sense does he allow that it is here used without any ambiguity? *In its primary sense?* The statement in the book of Enoch that souls shall not be put to death in the judgment implies, beyond any doubt, according to Mr. Bartlett, that souls shall not hereafter lose their physical existence. The loss of physical existence then; *i. e.*, the primary sense of the word death, is allowed by Mr. Bartlett to be its indubitable, unambiguous sense when applied to future punishment! But this is all that we contend for, and this is what he has been strenuously arguing against through his labored volume! Mr. Bartlett has refuted himself. He reminds us of the child who has with great pains built up a house of cards, and just when it was close to completion with an unlucky jerk of his elbow leveled it to the ground.

But besides the plain and primary sense of the terms used in Scripture for future punishment, and which no learning or ingenuity can set aside, we have other and decisive reasons for rejecting Mr. Bartlett's theory as contradictory to Scripture and slanderous in the highest degree to the character of God. Here, as everywhere throughout our review, we fully acquit Mr. Bartlett of any intentional misrepresentation: we only speak of the real effects of his theory. But no tenderness to individual feeling should prevent our speaking openly and boldly of a system which is undermining the faith of multitudes, disgusting devout and holy minds, and sending great numbers to seek their refuge from its horrors in the dangerous and delusive theory of universal restoration. In order to show our readers our additional reasons for rejecting Mr. Bartlett's theory of the second death, it will be necessary to recall their attention *to what he means by it.*

A clear definition of meaning will always be found fatal to error. In haziness and obscurity alone can the teachers of heresy hope to avoid detection. Of such obscurity Mr. Bartlett is not guilty. He tells us what he means by "death" as the future punishment for sinners, and thereby enables us the more readily to expose his mistake. This future "death" then of the sinner to which God will sentence him, is, according to Prof. Bartlett, "the effect of sin," the loss of the soul's "true functional action," its perverted "moral or spiritual state," the "slavery of sin."

UMI

"broken with *words*," "broken with *sorrow*," "lacerated with *grief*," "melted with *emotion*," "drowned in *sorrow*," we see as a matter of course that the various phrases are not to be taken in their ordinary meaning. Neither "words" nor "sorrow" literally break a man's bones: nor does "grief" lacerate his body as a tiger or a lion does: nor does "emotion" possess the liquefying power of fire: nor is "sorrow" the water either of land or sea; and, therefore, we know that we are not to take the terms in their primary sense. But under other and ordinary circumstances these and similar terms as a matter of course take their primary and ordinary meaning.

There are whole classes of documents, such as all directly or indirectly connected with law and jurisprudence, where this secondary sense is wholly inadmissible. If we heard a criminal condemned by a judge to death gravely pleading that his physical existence should not be taken from him because he had understood the legal penalty of "death" in a secondary sense, it is quite possible that he might be saved from the scaffold and the hangman; but it would only be by his being sent to a Lunatic Asylum as an incurable madman. That God's jurisprudence should be interpreted in a similar way, his awful penalty of sin explained by the tropes of poetry and the hyperbole of grief, is an outrage even of a graver kind because mixed up with a higher destiny and the Great Judge of the universe. *Yet such is "Prof. Bartlett's commentary upon the laws of God!"*

Shall we answer Mr. Bartlett out of his own mouth? Shall we show from his own words that he feels and knows right well that all his labored argument is mere special pleading, and that the edifice he has built up with so much pains is but a child's house of cards which a breath can blow down? Shall we bring him forward incautiously confessing that that primary sense of the word "death" which he has stigmatized as "low" and "sensual," and has affected to all but obliterate from "common use, and Scripture, and the best lexicographers," is its "*explicit*" and "*unambiguous*" *sense when applied to future punishment?* We will.

At p. 386 he is quoting from the book of Enoch an account of future punishment. Of "sinners ripened in guilt," this apocryphal writer tells us: "They shall be with the wicked, and like them, but *their souls shall not be put to death* in the day of judgment, nor shall they come out from hence." Mr. Bartlett's pithy and excellent comment on this description of the genuine Augustinian doctrine of the eternal life of misery of the lost is—"*there is no ambiguity here.*" About what does he allow that there is no ambiguity? Upon the sense of the word "death." In what sense does he allow that it is here used without any ambiguity? *In its primary sense?* The statement in the book of Enoch that souls shall not be put to death in the judgment implies, beyond any doubt, according to Mr. Bartlett, that souls shall not hereafter lose their physical existence. The loss of physical existence then; *i. e.*, the primary sense of the word death, is allowed by Mr. Bartlett to be its indubitable, unambiguous sense when applied to future punishment! But this is all that we contend for, and this is what he has been strenuously arguing against through his labored volume! Mr. Bartlett has refuted himself. He reminds us of the child who has with great pains built up a house of cards, and just when it was close to completion with an unlucky jerk of his elbow leveled it to the ground.

But besides the plain and primary sense of the terms used in Scripture for future punishment, and which no learning or ingenuity can set aside, we have other and decisive reasons for rejecting Mr. Bartlett's theory as contradictory to Scripture and slanderous in the highest degree to the character of God. Here, as everywhere throughout our review, we fully acquit Mr. Bartlett of any intentional misrepresentation: we only speak of the real effects of his theory. But no tenderness to individual feeling should prevent our speaking openly and boldly of a system which is undermining the faith of multitudes, disgusting devout and holy minds, and sending great numbers to seek their refuge from its horrors in the dangerous and delusive theory of universal restoration. In order to show our readers our additional reasons for rejecting Mr. Bartlett's theory of the second death, it will be necessary to recall their attention *to what he means by it.*

A clear definition of meaning will always be found fatal to error. In haziness and obscurity alone can the teachers of heresy hope to avoid detection. Of such obscurity Mr. Bartlett is not guilty. He tells us what he means by "death" as the future punishment for sinners, and thereby enables us the more readily to expose his mistake. This future "death" then of the sinner to which God will sentence him, is, according to Prof. Bartlett, "the effect of sin," the loss of the soul's "true functional action," its perverted "moral or spiritual state," the "slavery of sin."

UMI

(pp. 36, 41, 49, 69.) It is "that state of separation from God, and from the beatific fruition of God, in which all the higher faculties of human nature are working falsely and discordantly; in which the true end of living is discarded, and its true enjoyment lost; *and in which there is at last the complete extinction*, not of the soul's being, *but of its well-being.*" (p. 46.) It is, according to him, *the continuance and carrying out of a process already going on here.* "Men are accordingly represented *as being even now* in a spiritual condition called 'death,' to be followed by the full and final consummation, which is the second death:" "each state begins here, and is consummated hereafter." (p. 49.) Our readers will perceive from these extracts that the second death according to Prof. Bartlett is nothing else in character than that "death in sin" of which Paul speaks in Eph. 2: 1, carried out to its supposed full consummation, and perpetuated in the future world in hell.

Here, among other things, are three distinct propositions of Mr. Bartlett which are contrary to Scripture. In the first place he affirms that the punishment which God tells us he will inflict after the judgment in hell has already begun upon this earth, and is *in its character and nature* nothing different from what is now, and has from the commencement of moral evil and sin, been going on among sinful men, and, of course, among fallen angels also. In the second place he tells us that the second death is to have the effect of "*consummating*" *and completing that* "*moral wreck*," which before has been only partially effected. In the third place he tells us that *God has ordained* the second death for *the purpose of* "*consummating*" *and completing that* "*moral wreck*," which had not found its consummation before. Such is the theory which this learned Professor advances as the effect of future punishment, and God's object in punishing! *Is this Christianity?* A thousand times we answer, it is a foul slander upon the religion of a wise and holy God.

In the first place it is contradictory to Scripture to say that the future punishment of hell is a continuation, even in a more intensified form, of the punishment already begun here on earth. This is not the teaching of Scripture. Hell is not, according to Scripture, the continuation of a process already begun, but a new process begun after the judgment. It is "*prepared* for the devil and his angels," and for those condemned in the judgment, but until after the judgment neither men nor angels endure it in

any measure or degree. (Matt. 25: 41.) This is very clearly seen from the language of the unclean spirits when on various occasions they were brought into contact with Christ. Thus upon one occasion they asked him—"Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8: 29.) Their torments had not *begun!* But according to Mr. Bartlett, their torments would have been in full operation and consummated: for if the second death were, as he tells us, "the complete extinction of the soul's well-being, which is, according to him, accompanied with a corresponding extinction of happiness and the presence of misery, then fallen angels, whose "well-being" we should suppose Mr. Bartlett will allow is by this time completely extinguished, would have been in the full endurance of the torments of the second death. But we have their own testimony for saying that those torments have not so much as begun: and we are satisfied that they know their own condition better than Mr. Bartlett does. But if so, the second death is not a process *already begun*, and so falls this proposition of the Professor's theory. *The punishment of the wicked is future*, and such is the uniform testimony of Scripture. (Rom. 2: 5; Mark 1: 24; 2 Thess. 2: 9.) It is therefore a different thing from that "death in sin" and attendant loss of "well-being" with which Mr. Bartlett would fain identify it. It is the punishment which God will inflict upon those who are already and before it falls "dead in sin."

Again, Mr. Bartlett tells us that the second death is *to* "*consummate*" that "moral wreck" and loss of "true functional action" which has here only "begun." Again the case of the fallen angels meets our Professor and rudely contradicts his theory. Are the fallen angels but novices in evil? Are not "all the higher faculties" of their "nature working as falsely and as discordantly" as it is possible for them to do? Such is certainly the idea which Scripture leads us to hold. But, if so, the second death is not for the "extinction" of a "*well-being*" which is already extinguished, for the destruction of a "true functional action," which is already destroyed as completely as it is possible for it to be. The second death, Prof. Bartlett, is for devils as well as reprobate men, and the utter "moral wreck" of their once noble nature shows us that this second death has not such an object as you propose for it.

Once more we reject as a foul slander upon a holy God the idea which Mr. Bartlett's theory brings prominently forward,

UMI

(pp. 36, 41, 49, 69.) It is "that state of separation from God, and from the beatific fruition of God, in which all the higher faculties of human nature are working falsely and discordantly; in which the true end of living is discarded, and its true enjoyment lost; *and in which there is at last the complete extinction*, not of the soul's being, *but of its well-being.*" (p. 46.) It is, according to him, *the continuance and carrying out of a process already going on here.* "Men are accordingly represented *as being even now* in a spiritual condition called 'death,' to be followed by the full and final consummation, which is the second death:" "each state begins here, and is consummated hereafter." (p. 49.) Our readers will perceive from these extracts that the second death according to Prof. Bartlett is nothing else in character than that "death in sin" of which Paul speaks in Eph. 2: 1, carried out to its supposed full consummation, and perpetuated in the future world in hell.

Here, among other things, are three distinct propositions of Mr. Bartlett which are contrary to Scripture. In the first place he affirms that the punishment which God tells us he will inflict after the judgment in hell has already begun upon this earth, and is *in its character and nature* nothing different from what is now, and has from the commencement of moral evil and sin, been going on among sinful men, and, of course, among fallen angels also. In the second place he tells us that the second death is to have the effect of "*consummating*" *and completing that* "*moral wreck*," which before has been only partially effected. In the third place he tells us that *God has ordained* the second death for *the purpose of* "*consummating*" *and completing that* "*moral wreck*," which had not found its consummation before. Such is the theory which this learned Professor advances as the effect of future punishment, and God's object in punishing! *Is this Christianity?* A thousand times we answer, it is a foul slander upon the religion of a wise and holy God.

In the first place it is contradictory to Scripture to say that the future punishment of hell is a continuation, even in a more intensified form, of the punishment already begun here on earth. This is not the teaching of Scripture. Hell is not, according to Scripture, the continuation of a process already begun, but a new process begun after the judgment. It is "*prepared* for the devil and his angels," and for those condemned in the judgment, but until after the judgment neither men nor angels endure it in

any measure or degree. (Matt. 25: 41.) This is very clearly seen from the language of the unclean spirits when on various occasions they were brought into contact with Christ. Thus upon one occasion they asked him—"Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8: 29.) Their torments had not *begun!* But according to Mr. Bartlett, their torments would have been in full operation and consummated: for if the second death were, as he tells us, "the complete extinction of the soul's well-being, which is, according to him, accompanied with a corresponding extinction of happiness and the presence of misery, then fallen angels, whose "well-being" we should suppose Mr. Bartlett will allow is by this time completely extinguished, would have been in the full endurance of the torments of the second death. But we have their own testimony for saying that those torments have not so much as begun: and we are satisfied that they know their own condition better than Mr. Bartlett does. But if so, the second death is not a process *already begun*, and so falls this proposition of the Professor's theory. *The punishment of the wicked is future*, and such is the uniform testimony of Scripture. (Rom. 2: 5; Mark 1: 24; 2 Thess. 2: 9.) It is therefore a different thing from that "death in sin" and attendant loss of "well-being" with which Mr. Bartlett would fain identify it. It is the punishment which God will inflict upon those who are already and before it falls "dead in sin."

Again, Mr. Bartlett tells us that the second death is *to* "*consummate*" that "moral wreck" and loss of "true functional action" which has here only "begun." Again the case of the fallen angels meets our Professor and rudely contradicts his theory. Are the fallen angels but novices in evil? Are not "all the higher faculties" of their "nature working as falsely and as discordantly" as it is possible for them to do? Such is certainly the idea which Scripture leads us to hold. But, if so, the second death is not for the "extinction" of a "*well-being*" which is already extinguished, for the destruction of a "true functional action," which is already destroyed as completely as it is possible for it to be. The second death, Prof. Bartlett, is for devils as well as reprobate men, and the utter "moral wreck" of their once noble nature shows us that this second death has not such an object as you propose for it.

Once more we reject as a foul slander upon a holy God the idea which Mr. Bartlett's theory brings prominently forward,

UMI

that God has ordained a punishment one of whose objects is the "consummation" of the destruction of the "*well*-being" of his creatures, the utter loss of the "true functional action" of the powers with which he originally endowed them, the production of a yet falser and more discordant working of the lofty faculties implanted in them by their Maker. We would suppose that the very recording of such as one of the objects of the second death would have startled Prof. Bartlett as a blasphemy unworthy of a Christian teacher. At all events we denounce it as such. God does not take up and complete the guilty work of fallen men and angels! We will not permit a theory far more derogatory to him than the old exploded heresy of the Manichæans to take any longer its place in our theology as a doctrine of the Gospel. The poor heretic of the third century fancied *two* eternal principles, one good, one evil, and his eternal principle of good only endured evil *because he could not help it.* But Mr. Bartlett and his school picture the One True Eternal Good God as *adding to, completing, consummating the evil which the abuse of their free will by angels and men first introduced.* He not only consummates moral evil, but he also, according to Mr. Bartlett, *perpetuates* it forever! And is this the boasted *orthodoxy* which it is heresy to oppose? It is itself a heresy, introduced into the Church when Christian Fathers forgot the warning of Paul against *philosophy*, and, with the intention of supporting the Gospel by philosophy, corrupted and depraved it thereby.

We had intended when we began our review to notice Mr. Bartlett's attempted support of his theory of the second death by his theory of the natural immortality of the soul. As we proceeded however we saw that we could not do this and at the same time give to the first and main division of his work that attention which was due to it. We preferred therefore to confine ourselves to the latter. We have written boldly and openly what we honestly thought, and now take our leave of our kind American friends with the earnest prayer that we and they separated by an intervening ocean may be joined in the bonds of the everlasting gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

THE ERRORS OF THE AGE.

Let us not be unjust, either to an individual or an age. Let us be charitable to both; not discoloring, nor distorting, nor gathering up hasty inferences; but speaking calmly, remembering that we ourselves are part of the age, and so, doubly bound, not to be mere haters of the false, but lovers of the true; not satirists nor slanderers, but men alive to the magnitude of the very least of good or evil, and desirous not to be mere assailants of the evil, but upbuilders of the good.

He who sees nothing but error in an age is quite as likely to be mistaken as he who sees nothing but truth; and yet, on the other hand, he who sees nothing but *progress* in our time is, beyond all doubt, afflicted with as sorrowful a delusion as he who sees in it nothing but *retrogression.*

It is not everything done in an age that is part of the age; and an error may be *in* the age, and yet not *of* it. It may be an isolation, an exception, an excrescence, not a characteristic; an exotic, not a thing of native growth. The solitary rock in mid-ocean is not a specimen of the sea; one weed is not a specimen of the garden, nor one palm-tree of the desert. One hasty word does not represent the man; nor does one blundering sentence stamp the character of the book. Let us deal fairly with the age and its utterances. As every freckle is not leprosy, and every leprosy is not epidemic, so every imperfection is not deadly, and even that which is deadly may perhaps stand alone. Before we can attach the error to the age, or the age to the error, let us see that the error is widespread or deep-rooted, or chronic, or influential, giving tone and complexion to theology, or literature, or public opinion; not a mere summer-ripple, raised by a momentary breeze, but a broad tidal wave moving shoreward, and imparting its brackishness to the stream up which it is noiselessly working.

It is well that this should be kept in mind in order to prevent either an over-estimate or an under-estimate of the evil.

Besides, the *greatness* of an error is one thing, and its *capacity* for mischief is quite another. That which in one age, or kingdom, or stage of the human mind and conscience, would be po-

UMI

that God has ordained a punishment one of whose objects is the "consummation" of the destruction of the "*well*-being" of his creatures, the utter loss of the "true functional action" of the powers with which he originally endowed them, the production of a yet falser and more discordant working of the lofty faculties implanted in them by their Maker. We would suppose that the very recording of such as one of the objects of the second death would have startled Prof. Bartlett as a blasphemy unworthy of a Christian teacher. At all events we denounce it as such. God does not take up and complete the guilty work of fallen men and angels! We will not permit a theory far more derogatory to him than the old exploded heresy of the Manichæans to take any longer its place in our theology as a doctrine of the Gospel. The poor heretic of the third century fancied *two* eternal principles, one good, one evil, and his eternal principle of good only endured evil *because he could not help it.* But Mr. Bartlett and his school picture the One True Eternal Good God as *adding to, completing, consummating the evil which the abuse of their free will by angels and men first introduced.* He not only consummates moral evil, but he also, according to Mr. Bartlett, *perpetuates* it forever! And is this the boasted *orthodoxy* which it is heresy to oppose? It is itself a heresy, introduced into the Church when Christian Fathers forgot the warning of Paul against *philosophy*, and, with the intention of supporting the Gospel by philosophy, corrupted and depraved it thereby.

We had intended when we began our review to notice Mr. Bartlett's attempted support of his theory of the second death by his theory of the natural immortality of the soul. As we proceeded however we saw that we could not do this and at the same time give to the first and main division of his work that attention which was due to it. We preferred therefore to confine ourselves to the latter. We have written boldly and openly what we honestly thought, and now take our leave of our kind American friends with the earnest prayer that we and they separated by an intervening ocean may be joined in the bonds of the everlasting gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

THE ERRORS OF THE AGE.

Let us not be unjust, either to an individual or an age. Let us be charitable to both; not discoloring, nor distorting, nor gathering up hasty inferences; but speaking calmly, remembering that we ourselves are part of the age, and so, doubly bound, not to be mere haters of the false, but lovers of the true; not satirists nor slanderers, but men alive to the magnitude of the very least of good or evil, and desirous not to be mere assailants of the evil, but upbuilders of the good.

He who sees nothing but error in an age is quite as likely to be mistaken as he who sees nothing but truth; and yet, on the other hand, he who sees nothing but *progress* in our time is, beyond all doubt, afflicted with as sorrowful a delusion as he who sees in it nothing but *retrogression.*

It is not everything done in an age that is part of the age; and an error may be *in* the age, and yet not *of* it. It may be an isolation, an exception, an excrescence, not a characteristic; an exotic, not a thing of native growth. The solitary rock in mid-ocean is not a specimen of the sea; one weed is not a specimen of the garden, nor one palm-tree of the desert. One hasty word does not represent the man; nor does one blundering sentence stamp the character of the book. Let us deal fairly with the age and its utterances. As every freckle is not leprosy, and every leprosy is not epidemic, so every imperfection is not deadly, and even that which is deadly may perhaps stand alone. Before we can attach the error to the age, or the age to the error, let us see that the error is widespread or deep-rooted, or chronic, or influential, giving tone and complexion to theology, or literature, or public opinion; not a mere summer-ripple, raised by a momentary breeze, but a broad tidal wave moving shoreward, and imparting its brackishness to the stream up which it is noiselessly working.

It is well that this should be kept in mind in order to prevent either an over-estimate or an under-estimate of the evil.

Besides, the *greatness* of an error is one thing, and its *capacity* for mischief is quite another. That which in one age, or kingdom, or stage of the human mind and conscience, would be po-

UMI

tent for evil, in another age, or kingdom, or stage of the human mind and conscience, is totally innocuous. What a book of error and cunningly-devised fable is the Koran! But is its power of injury commensurate with the magnitude of its errors? A thousand years ago it was a book of power; in our age it is feeble as the voice or hand of a child. In Bagdad, or Cairo, or Constantinople, it is powerful; in London or Paris, in Dublin or Edinburg, it is impotent. Among the oriental races, even half a century ago it went forth and was responded to by the eastern mind and conscience of that generation; now the scepticism of the age has so told upon the Moslem race, that their prophet's volume is beginning to lose its hold upon multitudes; conscience has passed into a new stage, and it no longer responds to the appeals which once would have stirred all its depths.

In fact, we may say that in many cases it is the magnitude of the error that is its weakness. Were it less in size, or less audaciously untrue; were it less audible, less visible, it would be more pernicious and more infectious, more seductive and perilous. So that often that which error gains in greatness it loses in influence and efficiency. Of two lies, or systems of lies, it is frequently the minute and half invisible, not the imposing and colossal that is the more extensively mischievous. The volcano thunders and smokes, but you see it and keep aloof; the scorpion, hidden under the stone on which you are sitting, or the snake, dropping from the bough under whose shade you are cooling yourself, strikes its tiny fang into your limb, and the little drop of invisible poison pours death into your veins. A Voltaire rages and blasphemes. He proclaims the Bible to be a fable of the priesthood. You stand afar off, and his voice reaches you not. Another man rises, clad in priestly garb, uttering no blasphemy, and professing to venerate religion. He blandly suggests that the Bible is "unhistorical." Unhistorical! Yes; that is all. It is a smooth word, but under it is hidden the poison of the adder. By "unhistorical" he *seems* to the unpracticed ear to mean only at variance with common history; but he really means by it all that Voltaire and Paine did—fabulous and false; no truer than the Koran or the Shasters; the weak invention of some unknown impostors, who, like the camel-driver of Mecca, or Manu the son of Brachmar, compiled volumes of miracles, whose genuineness they did not themselves believe. Satan, as the Prince of darkness, had overreached himself; he is now

clothing himself in the garb of an angel of light, and arraying error in the seemly raiment of science and philosophy, and poetry or humanity; he is sending it abroad to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. The vulgar blasphemies of other days would not serve his purpose now, so he makes a selection of the least offensive; and even for that select number he is at pains to provide a more polite and less audacious phraseology, which will not altogether shock even religious men, and which will yet lodge in their minds the seeds of the same remorseless infidelity that, from the beginning, has set itself to overthrow the book of God. He has picked up the spent shafts of Celsus, and Porphyry, and Blount, and Toland, and Hume, and Bolingbroke, and Voltaire; and having painted, feathered, pointed, and poisoned them anew, he puts them not into the hand of the scoffer, not into the quiver of the profane, but into the hand and quiver of men who are called friends of religion and ministers of Christ. The goddess of reason has put on the mitre now, and speaks from sacred ground. It was once but the infidelity of the press and the platform, it is the infidelity of the pulpit and the altar now.

Thus many of the errors of the present day go forth with an authority which they never had before; and are listened to by thousands who denounce the infidelities of the past. A new standing-point, new vantage-ground has been secured for error. An undue and undeserved (not to say dishonest) position has been attained by it; and the resurrection of exploded sophistries is received as the discovery of new and irresistible argument.

Besides all this there is great difficulty in taking the measurements of many modern errors, of ascertaining their exact dimensions and character and tendencies. They are so intangible and indefinite. You can lay hands on a skeleton of however gigantic dimensions, but no one can undertake to deal with a spectre—a ghost, however imposing in its stature or aspect. You can measure a mountain, but not a cloud, still less a mist; you can grasp the shower-drops, but not a rainbow; you can analyze the light, but not the darkness. So indeed we find it difficult to handle the dreamy abstractions, the incoherent sentimentalisms, the broken reveries, the gorgeous pictorialisms, the swamp-born exhalations which meet us on every side in connection with the "young" theologies and philosophic transcendentalisms of the day. They raise the cry of liberality, progress, geniality, large-

UMI

tent for evil, in another age, or kingdom, or stage of the human mind and conscience, is totally innocuous. What a book of error and cunningly-devised fable is the Koran! But is its power of injury commensurate with the magnitude of its errors? A thousand years ago it was a book of power; in our age it is feeble as the voice or hand of a child. In Bagdad, or Cairo, or Constantinople, it is powerful; in London or Paris, in Dublin or Edinburg, it is impotent. Among the oriental races, even half a century ago it went forth and was responded to by the eastern mind and conscience of that generation; now the scepticism of the age has so told upon the Moslem race, that their prophet's volume is beginning to lose its hold upon multitudes; conscience has passed into a new stage, and it no longer responds to the appeals which once would have stirred all its depths.

In fact, we may say that in many cases it is the magnitude of the error that is its weakness. Were it less in size, or less audaciously untrue; were it less audible, less visible, it would be more pernicious and more infectious, more seductive and perilous. So that often that which error gains in greatness it loses in influence and efficiency. Of two lies, or systems of lies, it is frequently the minute and half invisible, not the imposing and colossal that is the more extensively mischievous. The volcano thunders and smokes, but you see it and keep aloof; the scorpion, hidden under the stone on which you are sitting, or the snake, dropping from the bough under whose shade you are cooling yourself, strikes its tiny fang into your limb, and the little drop of invisible poison pours death into your veins. A Voltaire rages and blasphemes. He proclaims the Bible to be a fable of the priesthood. You stand afar off, and his voice reaches you not. Another man rises, clad in priestly garb, uttering no blasphemy, and professing to venerate religion. He blandly suggests that the Bible is "unhistorical." Unhistorical! Yes; that is all. It is a smooth word, but under it is hidden the poison of the adder. By "unhistorical" he *seems* to the unpracticed ear to mean only at variance with common history; but he really means by it all that Voltaire and Paine did—fabulous and false; no truer than the Koran or the Shasters; the weak invention of some unknown impostors, who, like the camel-driver of Mecca, or Manu the son of Brachmar, compiled volumes of miracles, whose genuineness they did not themselves believe. Satan, as the Prince of darkness, had overreached himself; he is now

clothing himself in the garb of an angel of light, and arraying error in the seemly raiment of science and philosophy, and poetry or humanity; he is sending it abroad to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. The vulgar blasphemies of other days would not serve his purpose now, so he makes a selection of the least offensive; and even for that select number he is at pains to provide a more polite and less audacious phraseology, which will not altogether shock even religious men, and which will yet lodge in their minds the seeds of the same remorseless infidelity that, from the beginning, has set itself to overthrow the book of God. He has picked up the spent shafts of Celsus, and Porphyry, and Blount, and Toland, and Hume, and Bolingbroke, and Voltaire; and having painted, feathered, pointed, and poisoned them anew, he puts them not into the hand of the scoffer, not into the quiver of the profane, but into the hand and quiver of men who are called friends of religion and ministers of Christ. The goddess of reason has put on the mitre now, and speaks from sacred ground. It was once but the infidelity of the press and the platform, it is the infidelity of the pulpit and the altar now.

Thus many of the errors of the present day go forth with an authority which they never had before; and are listened to by thousands who denounce the infidelities of the past. A new standing-point, new vantage-ground has been secured for error. An undue and undeserved (not to say dishonest) position has been attained by it; and the resurrection of exploded sophistries is received as the discovery of new and irresistible argument.

Besides all this there is great difficulty in taking the measurements of many modern errors, of ascertaining their exact dimensions and character and tendencies. They are so intangible and indefinite. You can lay hands on a skeleton of however gigantic dimensions, but no one can undertake to deal with a spectre—a ghost, however imposing in its stature or aspect. You can measure a mountain, but not a cloud, still less a mist; you can grasp the shower-drops, but not a rainbow; you can analyze the light, but not the darkness. So indeed we find it difficult to handle the dreamy abstractions, the incoherent sentimentalisms, the broken reveries, the gorgeous pictorialisms, the swamp-born exhalations which meet us on every side in connection with the "young" theologies and philosophic transcendentalisms of the day. They raise the cry of liberality, progress, geniality, large-

UMI

mindedness, freedom from old-world fetters, and they brand the defense of old creeds as the mere poverty of intellect or the timorous conservatism of men who are too stupid, too indolent, too cowardly to think for themselves. Their battle-word is "young England," or "young Germany," or "young France;" as if they had monopolized the youth of the world; or perhaps "young faith," "young truth," "young Christendom," as if *in* them and *through* them theology and philosophy were renewing their prime—assuming a nobler form, and brushing aside the obsoletisms of a trammeled and uninstructed past, to emerge into a largeness and a liberty such as Moses or Daniel, such as Paul or John, had never known. And may we not predict that the watchword "young Christendom" will soon be drowned in that of "young Rome" or "young Babylon," when the fermenting theologies and philosophies of the day shall subside into one dark creed of satanic error, a compound of positivism and negativism, of supernaturalism and atheism, of superstition and infidelity, of all beliefs and of no belief; a strange dualism of religion and irreligion, of spiritualism, and secularism, of socialism and despotism, which will unite the world in submission to the great anti-Christian enemy of God? That which now worships unsanctified genius, and to whom goodness apart from high intellect is a term of reproach, which shelters itself under the name of progressive theology, or philosophic eclecticism, or a re-adjustment of Christianity, will develop into a disbelief of all fixed creeds, it may be into a refined heathenism—certainly into a denial of the one Jehovah and his incarnate Son.

I enter into no comparison between the present and the past; nor do I attempt to ascertain what and how much we may have gained or lost; yet let me say that it ought to be acknowledged that the modern developments of evil have been met with large compensations and counteractions in the growths and evolutions of good; and that the augmented and intensified energy of error has been, in no small measure, the result of the new life and power which have, by the all-quickening Spirit, been infused into truth. That which was "from above" came first, and was met immediately by that which is "from beneath." The resurrection of the false was preceded by the resurrection of the true. While truth slept, error also slept; when truth awoke, error also awoke; and the aggression of the former was the signal for the aggression of the latter. The armies of hell have mustered because the hosts of heaven had already taken the field.

I do not attempt either to enumerate or to classify the errors of the age; I simply point out a few of the more prominent and perilous—those especially that have both root and seed, not broken branches, nor cut-down stems, but living and productive. It is of errors connected with man's religious being, or with religion itself, that I mean to speak; understanding by religion, not a cluster of abstractions, but *the acting out of each man's personal relationship to God.*

The religious movements of our day have not been the mere diffusion of certain abstractions, the mere effervescence of certain doctrines. No truth, however true, could of itself accomplish what has been wrought within these forty years. God himself has come down. It is a divine voice that has spoken, and a divine hand that has been working. It is no mere summer breath that has swept over the churchyard, and clothed its heaving turf with verdure; it is the Spirit of the living God that has gone into the tombs and touched the dry bones, and made dead men live.

Yet this is what the world not merely overlooks, but rejects. It is the admission of *a divine element* into any movement, or any truth, or any dogma, that is refused. I do not say a *supernatural* element; for, strange to tell, there are not a few, even of the educated and the literary, that admit the supernatural while they reject the divine; nay, receive the former on purpose to be able to resist and deny the latter: as we see in the tens of thousands in America, on the Continent, and in our own islands, who are the enthusiastic devotees of Spiritualism and all its spirit-rapping delusions.

The expulsion, then—I do not say of a supernatural, or spiritual, or transcendental, but of a strictly *divine* element from our faith, either in its origin, its basis, or its contents—is what the fallen intellect has decided on as indispensable to its own free action in the investigation of truth. The recognition of a divine element would be considered as vitiating the whole process of inquiry, and the absence of such would be regarded as a necessary condition of authentic faith, and an essential criterion of the genuineness of the truth believed. For it is not speculation or opinion that the natural heart so desperately hates, but God himself, and whatever contains God.

UMI

mindedness, freedom from old-world fetters, and they brand the defense of old creeds as the mere poverty of intellect or the timorous conservatism of men who are too stupid, too indolent, too cowardly to think for themselves. Their battle-word is "young England," or "young Germany," or "young France;" as if they had monopolized the youth of the world; or perhaps "young faith," "young truth," "young Christendom," as if *in* them and *through* them theology and philosophy were renewing their prime—assuming a nobler form, and brushing aside the obsoletisms of a trammeled and uninstructed past, to emerge into a largeness and a liberty such as Moses or Daniel, such as Paul or John, had never known. And may we not predict that the watchword "young Christendom" will soon be drowned in that of "young Rome" or "young Babylon," when the fermenting theologies and philosophies of the day shall subside into one dark creed of satanic error, a compound of positivism and negativism, of supernaturalism and atheism, of superstition and infidelity, of all beliefs and of no belief; a strange dualism of religion and irreligion, of spiritualism, and secularism, of socialism and despotism, which will unite the world in submission to the great anti-Christian enemy of God? That which now worships unsanctified genius, and to whom goodness apart from high intellect is a term of reproach, which shelters itself under the name of progressive theology, or philosophic eclecticism, or a re-adjustment of Christianity, will develop into a disbelief of all fixed creeds, it may be into a refined heathenism—certainly into a denial of the one Jehovah and his incarnate Son.

I enter into no comparison between the present and the past; nor do I attempt to ascertain what and how much we may have gained or lost; yet let me say that it ought to be acknowledged that the modern developments of evil have been met with large compensations and counteractions in the growths and evolutions of good; and that the augmented and intensified energy of error has been, in no small measure, the result of the new life and power which have, by the all-quickening Spirit, been infused into truth. That which was "from above" came first, and was met immediately by that which is "from beneath." The resurrection of the false was preceded by the resurrection of the true. While truth slept, error also slept; when truth awoke, error also awoke; and the aggression of the former was the signal for the aggression of the latter. The armies of hell have mustered because the hosts of heaven had already taken the field.

I do not attempt either to enumerate or to classify the errors of the age; I simply point out a few of the more prominent and perilous—those especially that have both root and seed, not broken branches, nor cut-down stems, but living and productive. It is of errors connected with man's religious being, or with religion itself, that I mean to speak; understanding by religion, not a cluster of abstractions, but *the acting out of each man's personal relationship to God.*

The religious movements of our day have not been the mere diffusion of certain abstractions, the mere effervescence of certain doctrines. No truth, however true, could of itself accomplish what has been wrought within these forty years. God himself has come down. It is a divine voice that has spoken, and a divine hand that has been working. It is no mere summer breath that has swept over the churchyard, and clothed its heaving turf with verdure; it is the Spirit of the living God that has gone into the tombs and touched the dry bones, and made dead men live.

Yet this is what the world not merely overlooks, but rejects. It is the admission of *a divine element* into any movement, or any truth, or any dogma, that is refused. I do not say a *supernatural* element; for, strange to tell, there are not a few, even of the educated and the literary, that admit the supernatural while they reject the divine; nay, receive the former on purpose to be able to resist and deny the latter: as we see in the tens of thousands in America, on the Continent, and in our own islands, who are the enthusiastic devotees of Spiritualism and all its spirit-rapping delusions.

The expulsion, then—I do not say of a supernatural, or spiritual, or transcendental, but of a strictly *divine* element from our faith, either in its origin, its basis, or its contents—is what the fallen intellect has decided on as indispensable to its own free action in the investigation of truth. The recognition of a divine element would be considered as vitiating the whole process of inquiry, and the absence of such would be regarded as a necessary condition of authentic faith, and an essential criterion of the genuineness of the truth believed. For it is not speculation or opinion that the natural heart so desperately hates, but God himself, and whatever contains God.

UMI

There are some who say "there is no God;" but they say it with a flippancy that disappoints and disconcerts us. If they suppose honestly that they have made this discovery, they, of all men, ought to be the most profoundly sorrowful. That this vast universe has no head, and that they themselves have no parent, is one of the most melancholy of all discoveries. That what we see and hear and touch is the terminus, the ultimatum or limit to that which is; that the infinite is an impossibility; that the sun has no brighter fountain than itself out of which it came; that the beautiful in nature has nothing more beautiful after whose image it was designed; that the lovable in man and man's world is the highest type and widest circle of the lovable; that the stream has no fountain more transparent than itself; that a parent's heart has no prototype or model in an infinite heart above; what a dark and sad discovery! What a disappointment, what a blank, what an infinite loss! To be cut off from the possibility of so much hope and beauty and perfection and love; to be confined within the narrow circle of the finite; surely this is sad! Yet those men who profess to have made this discovery are not sorrowful! Do they believe in their own discovery? Or is it the thought of having succeeded in expelling the divine from their creed that has cheered them into mirth?

There are others who say there is a God, but there is no intercourse between him and his creatures. The finite and the infinite are separated by a wide gulf. He has not spoken to man. His only speech is that of nature. There is no divine teaching save that of nature: and men talk of interrogating nature in order to learn the mind of the Creator. The sun and stars speak, but God is dumb. The seas and rivers speak, but God is dumb. The hills and forests speak, but God is dumb. Yet these men who have thus expelled the divine element from the circle of their being, seem not to miss it. They do not seem sensible of the awful loss which must be sustained by the creature in being cut off from all direct, all personal communication with God.

There are others who affirm that God has spoken, but not *intelligibly*. His words require an earthly interpreter; otherwise they are as dark as they are dangerous; as if God had muffled his words to prevent men hearing them; as if man alone could speak intelligible language! The Bible, they say, needs an interpreter; the Church is the sole interpreter; the priest is the

Church's organ; and only through the Church and the priest can God be made to speak intelligibly to man. And this absence of simplicity, this want of the intelligible and transparent, which in human writings is esteemed a defect and a proof of weakness, is not lamented as a loss and an imperfection, but triumphed in as a perfection and a gain! The divine element of simplicity and clearness which pervades the works of God must be banished from his word; and that without a sigh! The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows forth his handiwork; day unto day utters speech, and night unto night teacheth knowledge; so that even the peasant of the field, or the Bedawi of the desert, or the serf of Siberia may see and hear and understand; but the book of God gives no such glorious utterance of intelligible truth, till the Church's voice, more intelligible than that of the Holy Spirit, has spoken—man's speech removing the ambiguities of God, man's rendering legible the illegible handwriting of God; as if it were the Church and not the Lamb slain that had prevailed to open the book; as if it had been the priest and not the Lion of the tribe of Judah that had been found worthy to loose the seals.

But, say others, though God may have in a certain sense spoken *intelligibly*, yet he has not spoken *articulately*. The Bible is no doubt the book of God, but not to the same extent in which *The Faerie Queen* is Spenser's, or *Hamlet*, Shakespeare's, or *Paradise Lost*, Milton's. These works of men contain not only the *thoughts* of the writers, but their words; but as for the Bible, it embodies, no doubt, the *thoughts* of God; but to say that it contains the very words of God, his articulate speech, is unphilosophical in the extreme, and would assume that prophets and apostles were mere unintelligent machines or printing-presses. Suppose it were so, is it a degradation or a hardship for a creature to be a passive instrument in the hand of the God only wise, and would the book produced in this way, at the expense of the creature's liberty for an hour or a day, be less correct and less articulate? But, let the truth be spoken respecting both man and God. Man left to himself, to speak alone and act alone, is in bondage to influences which prevent his being *really himself*, which hamper his free thought, his free speech, his free action. It is only when taken possession of by the free Spirit, when filled with God, that he is truly himself, truly free either in thought or word. These hands are never more free than when the soul

UMI

There are some who say "there is no God;" but they say it with a flippancy that disappoints and disconcerts us. If they suppose honestly that they have made this discovery, they, of all men, ought to be the most profoundly sorrowful. That this vast universe has no head, and that they themselves have no parent, is one of the most melancholy of all discoveries. That what we see and hear and touch is the terminus, the ultimatum or limit to that which is; that the infinite is an impossibility; that the sun has no brighter fountain than itself out of which it came; that the beautiful in nature has nothing more beautiful after whose image it was designed; that the lovable in man and man's world is the highest type and widest circle of the lovable; that the stream has no fountain more transparent than itself; that a parent's heart has no prototype or model in an infinite heart above; what a dark and sad discovery! What a disappointment, what a blank, what an infinite loss! To be cut off from the possibility of so much hope and beauty and perfection and love; to be confined within the narrow circle of the finite; surely this is sad! Yet those men who profess to have made this discovery are not sorrowful! Do they believe in their own discovery? Or is it the thought of having succeeded in expelling the divine from their creed that has cheered them into mirth?

There are others who say there is a God, but there is no intercourse between him and his creatures. The finite and the infinite are separated by a wide gulf. He has not spoken to man. His only speech is that of nature. There is no divine teaching save that of nature: and men talk of interrogating nature in order to learn the mind of the Creator. The sun and stars speak, but God is dumb. The seas and rivers speak, but God is dumb. The hills and forests speak, but God is dumb. Yet these men who have thus expelled the divine element from the circle of their being, seem not to miss it. They do not seem sensible of the awful loss which must be sustained by the creature in being cut off from all direct, all personal communication with God.

There are others who affirm that God has spoken, but not *intelligibly*. His words require an earthly interpreter; otherwise they are as dark as they are dangerous; as if God had muffled his words to prevent men hearing them; as if man alone could speak intelligible language! The Bible, they say, needs an interpreter; the Church is the sole interpreter; the priest is the

Church's organ; and only through the Church and the priest can God be made to speak intelligibly to man. And this absence of simplicity, this want of the intelligible and transparent, which in human writings is esteemed a defect and a proof of weakness, is not lamented as a loss and an imperfection, but triumphed in as a perfection and a gain! The divine element of simplicity and clearness which pervades the works of God must be banished from his word; and that without a sigh! The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows forth his handiwork; day unto day utters speech, and night unto night teacheth knowledge; so that even the peasant of the field, or the Bedawi of the desert, or the serf of Siberia may see and hear and understand; but the book of God gives no such glorious utterance of intelligible truth, till the Church's voice, more intelligible than that of the Holy Spirit, has spoken—man's speech removing the ambiguities of God, man's rendering legible the illegible handwriting of God; as if it were the Church and not the Lamb slain that had prevailed to open the book; as if it had been the priest and not the Lion of the tribe of Judah that had been found worthy to loose the seals.

But, say others, though God may have in a certain sense spoken *intelligibly*, yet he has not spoken *articulately*. The Bible is no doubt the book of God, but not to the same extent in which *The Faerie Queen* is Spenser's, or *Hamlet*, Shakespeare's, or *Paradise Lost*, Milton's. These works of men contain not only the *thoughts* of the writers, but their words; but as for the Bible, it embodies, no doubt, the *thoughts* of God; but to say that it contains the very words of God, his articulate speech, is unphilosophical in the extreme, and would assume that prophets and apostles were mere unintelligent machines or printing-presses. Suppose it were so, is it a degradation or a hardship for a creature to be a passive instrument in the hand of the God only wise, and would the book produced in this way, at the expense of the creature's liberty for an hour or a day, be less correct and less articulate? But, let the truth be spoken respecting both man and God. Man left to himself, to speak alone and act alone, is in bondage to influences which prevent his being *really himself*, which hamper his free thought, his free speech, his free action. It is only when taken possession of by the free Spirit, when filled with God, that he is truly himself, truly free either in thought or word. These hands are never more free than when the soul

UMI

within moves them; these lips are not slaves, because acting according to the touch of the inner man; these eyes are not machines, because the intellect or the fancy kindles them into eloquent brightness; so the inspired prophet is not a machine, nor a pen, nor an electric wire, because God has come in and awakened his dormant being; because the Holy Spirit has set all his faculties in motion; because the master-hand has taken up the harp and passed his fingers over its silent strings, giving liberty to its imprisoned music, and calling forth a melody which but for that divine touch had been hidden there, in durance dark, unheard and unknown. The expulsion of the divine element from the *words* of Scripture seems to be reckoned by not a few amongst us rather a gain than a loss! The surrender of the perfect in a revelation is made without a sigh.

But, say the men of another class, though God may have spoken intelligibly and articulately, he has not spoken authoritatively. He has given us the Bible as a book of thought—a sort of hand-book or guide-book; but not a statute-book, not a promulgation of peremptory law, or infallible and inexorable truth. By this class of reasoners the divine element of *authority* is struck out, and man is allowed to trifle with the Scriptures, to play fast and loose with their revelations, as if they were the mere utterances of a higher kind of *genius* than that which gave us the *Iliad*, or the *Canterbury Tales*, or *Faust*, or *Locksley Hall*. Beauty, eloquence, lofty thought, tenderness, power, they allow to Scripture, but not authority! They will admire, but not obey. They will listen to its suggestions, but they decline its commands. They will study it, but they will not be bound by it. How this free-and-easy treatment of the Bible is reconcilable with the idea of a revelation from God, I do not now inquire. I point to it simply as another of the eliminations of the divine element from that which is yet recognized as a divine volume. How strangely desirous are some to thrust God out of his own book! How thoroughly they do this by this repudiation of infallibility and authority! And how blind they are to the loss which they themselves thus sustain in being shut out from all certainty by being deprived of all divine authority. [1]

It is hardly possible to read the Bible without feeling how sternly it condemns this laxity. If some of these free-and-easy

[1] We need not stay to show how this free-and-easy dealing with the authority of revelation leads to a free-and-easy theology, a free-and-easy creed, a free-and-easy morality.

commentators would speak out, they would pronounce it the most bigoted of all books. It is so unsparing in its denunciation of error and evil, and so uncompromising in its demands upon men for submission to its teaching. One God, one Christ, one book, one creed, one theology, one religion, one way to salvation! This is its unfaltering utterance from its first verse to its last. "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." It assumes the absolute authority of the Creator. It assumes that as his wisdom is perfect, so all its utterances must be authoritative. It proclaims truth not as an opinion, a speculation, a theory, but a *certainty*. It takes unhesitatingly for granted that all *error* is *sin;* that truth is *one*, and never becomes antiquated or obsolete, but always blooms in immortal youth, no length of years or ages availing to extract the divine element from what God has once spoken. *Unhistorical*, as some have, by means of ancient hieroglyphics or modern arithmetic, tried to prove it, it calmly, yet boldly claims to be one true history of heaven and earth, of things visible and invisible. *Mythical*, as others call it, it spreads before us the naked, rugged facts of four thousand years, each one a veritable fragment of humanity, the embodiment, not of dreams or fantasies, but of living truth. *Unphilosophical* as others affirm it to be, it presents to us its revelations as developments of the one authentic philosophy of mind and matter, of good and evil; not solicitous to defend itself from the charges of boasting or of foolishness which self-sufficient assailants have brought against it; and making no apology for announcing itself as the one volume which, like its Author, is immortal and incorruptible. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand forever."

That this disposition to eliminate or extract the divine element from the Bible is the root of wide-spread error, is obvious; and that the errors are deep and perilous is no less plain. The tendency of each is, in a greater or less degree, to get rid of a personal God, or to remove him to a distance from us, or to interpose a cloud between him and us, so that the reader of his book shall no longer meet him face to face in that book, but simply certain abstractions, certain algebraic symbols, or unknown quantities, which may or may not mean anything, which lay no hold upon the conscience, either for alarming or pacifying, which

UMI

within moves them; these lips are not slaves, because acting according to the touch of the inner man; these eyes are not machines, because the intellect or the fancy kindles them into eloquent brightness; so the inspired prophet is not a machine, nor a pen, nor an electric wire, because God has come in and awakened his dormant being; because the Holy Spirit has set all his faculties in motion; because the master-hand has taken up the harp and passed his fingers over its silent strings, giving liberty to its imprisoned music, and calling forth a melody which but for that divine touch had been hidden there, in durance dark, unheard and unknown. The expulsion of the divine element from the *words* of Scripture seems to be reckoned by not a few amongst us rather a gain than a loss! The surrender of the perfect in a revelation is made without a sigh.

But, say the men of another class, though God may have spoken intelligibly and articulately, he has not spoken authoritatively. He has given us the Bible as a book of thought—a sort of hand-book or guide-book; but not a statute-book, not a promulgation of peremptory law, or infallible and inexorable truth. By this class of reasoners the divine element of *authority* is struck out, and man is allowed to trifle with the Scriptures, to play fast and loose with their revelations, as if they were the mere utterances of a higher kind of *genius* than that which gave us the *Iliad*, or the *Canterbury Tales*, or *Faust*, or *Locksley Hall*. Beauty, eloquence, lofty thought, tenderness, power, they allow to Scripture, but not authority! They will admire, but not obey. They will listen to its suggestions, but they decline its commands. They will study it, but they will not be bound by it. How this free-and-easy treatment of the Bible is reconcilable with the idea of a revelation from God, I do not now inquire. I point to it simply as another of the eliminations of the divine element from that which is yet recognized as a divine volume. How strangely desirous are some to thrust God out of his own book! How thoroughly they do this by this repudiation of infallibility and authority! And how blind they are to the loss which they themselves thus sustain in being shut out from all certainty by being deprived of all divine authority. [1]

It is hardly possible to read the Bible without feeling how sternly it condemns this laxity. If some of these free-and-easy

[1] We need not stay to show how this free-and-easy dealing with the authority of revelation leads to a free-and-easy theology, a free-and-easy creed, a free-and-easy morality.

commentators would speak out, they would pronounce it the most bigoted of all books. It is so unsparing in its denunciation of error and evil, and so uncompromising in its demands upon men for submission to its teaching. One God, one Christ, one book, one creed, one theology, one religion, one way to salvation! This is its unfaltering utterance from its first verse to its last. "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." It assumes the absolute authority of the Creator. It assumes that as his wisdom is perfect, so all its utterances must be authoritative. It proclaims truth not as an opinion, a speculation, a theory, but a *certainty*. It takes unhesitatingly for granted that all *error* is *sin;* that truth is *one*, and never becomes antiquated or obsolete, but always blooms in immortal youth, no length of years or ages availing to extract the divine element from what God has once spoken. *Unhistorical*, as some have, by means of ancient hieroglyphics or modern arithmetic, tried to prove it, it calmly, yet boldly claims to be one true history of heaven and earth, of things visible and invisible. *Mythical*, as others call it, it spreads before us the naked, rugged facts of four thousand years, each one a veritable fragment of humanity, the embodiment, not of dreams or fantasies, but of living truth. *Unphilosophical* as others affirm it to be, it presents to us its revelations as developments of the one authentic philosophy of mind and matter, of good and evil; not solicitous to defend itself from the charges of boasting or of foolishness which self-sufficient assailants have brought against it; and making no apology for announcing itself as the one volume which, like its Author, is immortal and incorruptible. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand forever."

That this disposition to eliminate or extract the divine element from the Bible is the root of wide-spread error, is obvious; and that the errors are deep and perilous is no less plain. The tendency of each is, in a greater or less degree, to get rid of a personal God, or to remove him to a distance from us, or to interpose a cloud between him and us, so that the reader of his book shall no longer meet him face to face in that book, but simply certain abstractions, certain algebraic symbols, or unknown quantities, which may or may not mean anything, which lay no hold upon the conscience, either for alarming or pacifying, which

UMI

still leave the soul without a living personality either to worship or to love.

But this line of error goes further than the expulsion of the divine from the word of God. There is the transference of this to the creature, the deifying of man, the robbing God in order to enrich and magnify man. "Ye shall not surely die" was Satan's insidious commencement of the rejection of the divine element from what God had spoken; his second step was the promised transference of the divine to the human, "ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." As man ripens in iniquity, and as the errors we have dwelt upon unfold themselves, this daring transference—this full-blown impiety of anti-Christ—this last and worst form of man's infidelity will exhibit itself, both in the Church and in the world, consummating the evils of the perilous times of which the apostle has given us so appalling a picture.

Transfer the divine element to creation at large, you have *pantheism;* to images of brass or stone, you have *idolatry;* to the priest or the church, you have *Romanism;* to forms and rites and sacraments, and you have *tractarianism;* to the visible things of the senses, and you have *materialism;* to the invisibilities of disembodied spirits, and you have *spiritualism;* to the intellect, and you have *rationalism;* to the fancy, and you have religious *pictorialism;* to the feelings, and you have *religious sentimentalism;* transfer it to *man*, simply as man, and you have the last form of anti-Christ—the dethronization of the divine, the enthronization of the human, the rejection of the God-man and the exaltation of a man into his place as the only Messiah of the race, the world's only Redeemer and King.

Most subtle is the error that would have us deal with religious truth as a mere bundle of abstractions or ideas or speculations, of which every man is at liberty to form his own opinion. The essence of the Bible, the Alpha and Omega of revelation, is not truth alone, nor religion alone, but *Christianity*, a Christianity which is not presented to us merely as the communication of doctrines, but as the settlement of the great personal question between the sinner and God, the solution of the difficulty which law and conscience necessarily raise as to righteousness and grace.

And what is Christianity? Not metaphysics, not mysticism, not a compilation of guesses at truth. It is the history of the

seed of the woman—that seed the Word made flesh; the Word made flesh the revelation of the invisible Jehovah, the representative of the eternal God, the medium of communication between the Creator and the creature, between earth and heaven.

And of this Christianity what is the essential characteristic, the indispensable feature from first to last? Is it incarnation or blood shedding?[1] Is it the cradle or the cross? Is it the scene at Bethlehem or at Golgotha? Assuredly the latter! "Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani" is no mere outcry of suffering nature, the cross is no mere scene of human martyrdom, and the great sepulchre is no mere Hebrew tomb. It is only through *blood shedding* that conscience is purged; it is only at the *cross* that the sinner can meet with God; it is the *cross* that knits heaven and earth together; it is the cross that bears up the collapsing universe; it is the pierced hand that holds the golden sceptre; it is at Calvary that we find the open gate of paradise regained, and the gospel is good news to the sinner of liberty to enter in. Let men with the newly sharpened axes of rationalism do their utmost to hew down that cross, it will stand in spite of them. Let them apply their ecclesiastical paint-brush, and daub it all over with the most approved of mediæval pigments to cover its nakedness, its glory will shine through all. Let them scoff at the legal transference of the sinner's guilt to a divine substitute, and of that surety's righteousness to the sinner, as a Lutheran delusion or a Puritan fiction, that mutual transference, that wondrous exchange, will be found to be wrapped up with Christianity itself. Let those who, like Cain of old, shrink from the touch of sacrificial blood and mock the "religion of the shambles," purge their consciences with the idea of God's universal fatherhood, and try to wash their robes and make them white in something else than the blood of the Lamb; to us, as to the saints of other days, there is but one purging of the conscience, one security for pardon, one way of access, one bond of reconciliation, one healing of our wounds—the death of him on whom the chastisement of our peace was laid; and one everlasting song "unto him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

When we speak of error or of truth, we speak of an idea, an abstraction. But the Bible does not deal in mere ideas. It has an orbit of its own, a region of its own, a world of its own—very

[1] That is, the pouring out of the soul, or life, unto death.—Ed. Quar.

still leave the soul without a living personality either to worship or to love.

But this line of error goes further than the expulsion of the divine from the word of God. There is the transference of this to the creature, the deifying of man, the robbing God in order to enrich and magnify man. "Ye shall not surely die" was Satan's insidious commencement of the rejection of the divine element from what God had spoken; his second step was the promised transference of the divine to the human, "ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." As man ripens in iniquity, and as the errors we have dwelt upon unfold themselves, this daring transference—this full-blown impiety of anti-Christ—this last and worst form of man's infidelity will exhibit itself, both in the Church and in the world, consummating the evils of the perilous times of which the apostle has given us so appalling a picture.

Transfer the divine element to creation at large, you have *pantheism;* to images of brass or stone, you have *idolatry;* to the priest or the church, you have *Romanism;* to forms and rites and sacraments, and you have *tractarianism;* to the visible things of the senses, and you have *materialism;* to the invisibilities of disembodied spirits, and you have *spiritualism;* to the intellect, and you have *rationalism;* to the fancy, and you have religious *pictorialism;* to the feelings, and you have *religious sentimentalism;* transfer it to *man*, simply as man, and you have the last form of anti-Christ—the dethronization of the divine, the enthronization of the human, the rejection of the God-man and the exaltation of a man into his place as the only Messiah of the race, the world's only Redeemer and King.

Most subtle is the error that would have us deal with religious truth as a mere bundle of abstractions or ideas or speculations, of which every man is at liberty to form his own opinion. The essence of the Bible, the Alpha and Omega of revelation, is not truth alone, nor religion alone, but *Christianity*, a Christianity which is not presented to us merely as the communication of doctrines, but as the settlement of the great personal question between the sinner and God, the solution of the difficulty which law and conscience necessarily raise as to righteousness and grace.

And what is Christianity? Not metaphysics, not mysticism, not a compilation of guesses at truth. It is the history of the

seed of the woman—that seed the Word made flesh; the Word made flesh the revelation of the invisible Jehovah, the representative of the eternal God, the medium of communication between the Creator and the creature, between earth and heaven.

And of this Christianity what is the essential characteristic, the indispensable feature from first to last? Is it incarnation or blood shedding?[1] Is it the cradle or the cross? Is it the scene at Bethlehem or at Golgotha? Assuredly the latter! "Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani" is no mere outcry of suffering nature, the cross is no mere scene of human martyrdom, and the great sepulchre is no mere Hebrew tomb. It is only through *blood shedding* that conscience is purged; it is only at the *cross* that the sinner can meet with God; it is the *cross* that knits heaven and earth together; it is the cross that bears up the collapsing universe; it is the pierced hand that holds the golden sceptre; it is at Calvary that we find the open gate of paradise regained, and the gospel is good news to the sinner of liberty to enter in. Let men with the newly sharpened axes of rationalism do their utmost to hew down that cross, it will stand in spite of them. Let them apply their ecclesiastical paint-brush, and daub it all over with the most approved of mediæval pigments to cover its nakedness, its glory will shine through all. Let them scoff at the legal transference of the sinner's guilt to a divine substitute, and of that surety's righteousness to the sinner, as a Lutheran delusion or a Puritan fiction, that mutual transference, that wondrous exchange, will be found to be wrapped up with Christianity itself. Let those who, like Cain of old, shrink from the touch of sacrificial blood and mock the "religion of the shambles," purge their consciences with the idea of God's universal fatherhood, and try to wash their robes and make them white in something else than the blood of the Lamb; to us, as to the saints of other days, there is but one purging of the conscience, one security for pardon, one way of access, one bond of reconciliation, one healing of our wounds—the death of him on whom the chastisement of our peace was laid; and one everlasting song "unto him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

When we speak of error or of truth, we speak of an idea, an abstraction. But the Bible does not deal in mere ideas. It has an orbit of its own, a region of its own, a world of its own—very

[1] That is, the pouring out of the soul, or life, unto death.—Ed. Quar.

different from that into which the wisdom of men ever enters—an orbit of which God's throne is the centre, a world of *reality*, a region of *personality*, in which the distant becomes the near, the invisible the visible, and the shadowy the substantial and the palpable. In the Bible we look the living God in the face; and he fixes his gaze on us. Divine revelation, as developed in Christianity, is not the elucidation of certain unpractical or impersonal questions; but the adjustment of all that is *personal* between us and God, so that we shall know, of a certainty, that in believing we are forgiven all our iniquities. Christianity is not the mere improvement of natural religion, nor the correction of certain philosophical obliquities, nor the removal of certain heathen misrepresentations as to the character of God; but the settlement of the great controversy between us and God, the re-adjustment of our relationship to him, upon a basis and in a way which not merely secures future reconciliation for us, but gives us the present assurance of it, with all the peace, and the liberty, and the holiness which that assurance brings.

It is round the Christ of God that all truth revolves; and hence all error connected either with his person or his work must be perilous. The revelation of the Christ *begins at the beginning*, and sweeps round a vast circle. It takes up the whole question between the sinner and God, and gives judgment upon every part of it. It condemns man, and justifies God. It pronounces authoritatively, both as to the way of life and the way of death. It does not accept *earnestness* as a substitute for truth, nor a justification or extenuation of error. It does not show man how to lay the foundation of the great settlement for eternity, it lays the foundation and presents us with everything on God's side as finished. It begins by announcing what God has done, before it says one word of what man is to do; it shows us God as the doer and the giver—man as the receiver, setting aside unsparingly every religion and every doctrine which would make man either in whole or in part his own savior; or which would make worship or service a thing of proxy, and shift the personality and the responsibility of the great transaction between the soul and God, to a priest, or a minister, or a church, or a ceremony, or a sacrament, or a creed.

Thus it is that, through the belief of God's testimony to the great propitiation, we are not only justified, but we *know*, we are *assured*, that we are; and thus it is that, through the simple

reception of the glad tidings, all the gladness which they contain is transferred to us. Believing, we *rejoice;* we *are* saved; we *have* everlasting life.

The revelation of the Christ embraces in it the revelation of the Church in him, as his temple, his body, his bride; his present witness on earth, and the watcher for his return in glory. This Church, even on earth, is no mere association of men holding certain opinions, no mere corporation favored with certain privileges, but a body chosen and called out of a world of darkness. Its legislation is divine, not human; its laws are not its own ideas of expediency and order, but the commandments of its Head. The essence of its constitution is not socialism, nor republicanism, nor despotism, nor anarchy; but an unearthly organization founded on entire subjection to its heavenly Head; an organization working itself out in order, unity, growth, fruitfulness, love, and zeal. Its ministers are not philosophers, nor lecturers, nor theorists, nor humorists, nor orators, nor priests; but messengers of God's free love, expositors of the Word, and shepherds of the flock, and executors of government and discipline. Its members are not politicians, nor lovers of pleasure, nor worshipers of gold, nor men who are trying to make the best of both worlds; but men alive from the dead, through the power of the Holy Spirit, possessors of a heavenly peace, bearers of a cross, yet heirs of a kingdom, strangers upon the earth, yet citizens of the New Jerusalem, which cometh down from God out of heaven.

All the errors of the age we cannot hope to shun; yet many more we might be delivered from, did we trust more to the Heavenly Teacher and his heavenly teaching; for surely the promise is to us, "He will guide you into all truth.... Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things." Let us learn each truth directly from the Master's lips, so shall it be vital and productive; otherwise we shall be the possessors but of a second-hand, and therefore a second-rate religion—a reflected religion, with all the coldness of moonshine, but none of the warmth of the glorious sun; a timid and shriveled piety that does no mighty deeds, and speaks no words of power—that will not even stand the tear and wear of life, far less brave the brunt of battle, or compete for the martyr's crown.

It is *truth* that makes us free, for all error is bondage. If, then, you would be free men, grasp the truth, tenaciously, bravely,

UMI

different from that into which the wisdom of men ever enters—an orbit of which God's throne is the centre, a world of *reality*, a region of *personality*, in which the distant becomes the near, the invisible the visible, and the shadowy the substantial and the palpable. In the Bible we look the living God in the face; and he fixes his gaze on us. Divine revelation, as developed in Christianity, is not the elucidation of certain unpractical or impersonal questions; but the adjustment of all that is *personal* between us and God, so that we shall know, of a certainty, that in believing we are forgiven all our iniquities. Christianity is not the mere improvement of natural religion, nor the correction of certain philosophical obliquities, nor the removal of certain heathen misrepresentations as to the character of God; but the settlement of the great controversy between us and God, the re-adjustment of our relationship to him, upon a basis and in a way which not merely secures future reconciliation for us, but gives us the present assurance of it, with all the peace, and the liberty, and the holiness which that assurance brings.

It is round the Christ of God that all truth revolves; and hence all error connected either with his person or his work must be perilous. The revelation of the Christ *begins at the beginning*, and sweeps round a vast circle. It takes up the whole question between the sinner and God, and gives judgment upon every part of it. It condemns man, and justifies God. It pronounces authoritatively, both as to the way of life and the way of death. It does not accept *earnestness* as a substitute for truth, nor a justification or extenuation of error. It does not show man how to lay the foundation of the great settlement for eternity, it lays the foundation and presents us with everything on God's side as finished. It begins by announcing what God has done, before it says one word of what man is to do; it shows us God as the doer and the giver—man as the receiver, setting aside unsparingly every religion and every doctrine which would make man either in whole or in part his own savior; or which would make worship or service a thing of proxy, and shift the personality and the responsibility of the great transaction between the soul and God, to a priest, or a minister, or a church, or a ceremony, or a sacrament, or a creed.

Thus it is that, through the belief of God's testimony to the great propitiation, we are not only justified, but we *know*, we are *assured*, that we are; and thus it is that, through the simple

reception of the glad tidings, all the gladness which they contain is transferred to us. Believing, we *rejoice;* we *are* saved; we *have* everlasting life.

The revelation of the Christ embraces in it the revelation of the Church in him, as his temple, his body, his bride; his present witness on earth, and the watcher for his return in glory. This Church, even on earth, is no mere association of men holding certain opinions, no mere corporation favored with certain privileges, but a body chosen and called out of a world of darkness. Its legislation is divine, not human; its laws are not its own ideas of expediency and order, but the commandments of its Head. The essence of its constitution is not socialism, nor republicanism, nor despotism, nor anarchy; but an unearthly organization founded on entire subjection to its heavenly Head; an organization working itself out in order, unity, growth, fruitfulness, love, and zeal. Its ministers are not philosophers, nor lecturers, nor theorists, nor humorists, nor orators, nor priests; but messengers of God's free love, expositors of the Word, and shepherds of the flock, and executors of government and discipline. Its members are not politicians, nor lovers of pleasure, nor worshipers of gold, nor men who are trying to make the best of both worlds; but men alive from the dead, through the power of the Holy Spirit, possessors of a heavenly peace, bearers of a cross, yet heirs of a kingdom, strangers upon the earth, yet citizens of the New Jerusalem, which cometh down from God out of heaven.

All the errors of the age we cannot hope to shun; yet many more we might be delivered from, did we trust more to the Heavenly Teacher and his heavenly teaching; for surely the promise is to us, "He will guide you into all truth.... Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things." Let us learn each truth directly from the Master's lips, so shall it be vital and productive; otherwise we shall be the possessors but of a second-hand, and therefore a second-rate religion—a reflected religion, with all the coldness of moonshine, but none of the warmth of the glorious sun; a timid and shriveled piety that does no mighty deeds, and speaks no words of power—that will not even stand the tear and wear of life, far less brave the brunt of battle, or compete for the martyr's crown.

It is *truth* that makes us free, for all error is bondage. If, then, you would be free men, grasp the truth, tenaciously, bravely,

UMI

calmly; bind it round you as a girdle, treasure it in your heart of hearts. "Buy the truth and sell it not;" that is, get it at any cost, part with it never. Error is sin, for which every man shall give an account to God; and *sin* is no mere mischance or misfortune that claims pity only, but not condemnation nor punishment; else what means the fiery law; what means the cross of the sin-bearer; what means the great white throne; what means the everlasting fire?[1] "Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth," remembering your high calling, as witnesses for the truth and the True One. Let neither your words nor your lives give any uncertain sound. Every man to whom the Bible comes is responsible for believing all the truth which that revelation proclaims, and for rejecting all the error which it condemns. Cleave, then, to the Word of the living God; and sit, as teachable disciples, at the feet of him who has said learn of me. So shall you be led into all truth and delivered from all error. Otherwise, how shall you stand, either now or in the evil day? How shall you hope to win the victory, or receive the recompense to him that overcometh? We once saw a painting—the representation of the last struggle of an ancient king. He and three of his pursuers are on horseback, engaged hand to hand in deadly battle. Even with such odds, he looks a man, for stature and strength and sinew, fitted to win the day. But the shield which he holds in his left hand is broken; the sword which he grasps so firmly in his right, is snapped in two, and his helmet has fallen from his head. With half a sword, with a splintered shield, without a helmet—how can he, old warrior as he is, win the field? What can he do but die? Let us in our great battle of life remember this, and if we would overcome, let us take the *whole* armor of God—the shield, the breastplate, the helmet, and the sword. So shall we fight; so shall we be more than conquerors; and the God of peace shall bruise Satan under our feet shortly.

The day of error will not always last. The day of truth is coming. For we know that though in the last days perilous times shall come; yet beyond these there is the splendor of the most glorious day that ever dawned upon the earth; for he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry. He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.—*London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.*

[1] See Jude 7; 2 Pet. 2: 6; 2 Thess. 1: 8-10.

HADES AND HEAVEN.

By Eld. James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y.

Two widely different theories concerning the present state of the dead are entertained among those Protestants who believe in the immortality of the soul. The most popular of these can scarcely be called a theory of the intermediate state, since it recognizes no middle condition, but at once assigns the newly disembodied soul to the highest heaven or to the lowest hell. This will appear from the statements of some of its most distinguished advocates. Dr. Adam Clarke, commenting on 2 Cor. 5: 6, says:

"The apostle gives no intimation of an intermediate state between being at home in the body and being present with the Lord."

Thomas Scott says:

"If our sins be forgiven and our hearts renewed unto holiness, *heaven will be the rest of our souls*, whilst our bodies will be secretly hid in the grave."[1]

Albert Barnes says:

"The Christian when he leaves the body is at once with the Lord Jesus."[2] "Our pious friends that have died are now happy. They are with God. A father, or mother, or friend, that may have left us, is there—there in perfect felicity."[3]

Prof. Bartlett says:

"It is taught in the New Testament, that not only the soul of the Christian *might*, but that it *would*, enter and enjoy the presence of Christ at death; and that the continuance of its life here in the body actually delays its enjoyment of Christ's immediate presence in glory."....."It is affirmed that the believer, upon the death of the body, actually does enter heavenly blessedness at once."[4]

A well known author, but recently deceased, says:

[1] Observations on Job 14. [2] Remarks on 2 Cor. 5. [3] Note on Matt. 22: 32.
[4] *Life and Death Eternal*, pp. 196, 199.

UMI

calmly; bind it round you as a girdle, treasure it in your heart of hearts. "Buy the truth and sell it not;" that is, get it at any cost, part with it never. Error is sin, for which every man shall give an account to God; and *sin* is no mere mischance or misfortune that claims pity only, but not condemnation nor punishment; else what means the fiery law; what means the cross of the sin-bearer; what means the great white throne; what means the everlasting fire?[1] "Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth," remembering your high calling, as witnesses for the truth and the True One. Let neither your words nor your lives give any uncertain sound. Every man to whom the Bible comes is responsible for believing all the truth which that revelation proclaims, and for rejecting all the error which it condemns. Cleave, then, to the Word of the living God; and sit, as teachable disciples, at the feet of him who has said learn of me. So shall you be led into all truth and delivered from all error. Otherwise, how shall you stand, either now or in the evil day? How shall you hope to win the victory, or receive the recompense to him that overcometh? We once saw a painting—the representation of the last struggle of an ancient king. He and three of his pursuers are on horseback, engaged hand to hand in deadly battle. Even with such odds, he looks a man, for stature and strength and sinew, fitted to win the day. But the shield which he holds in his left hand is broken; the sword which he grasps so firmly in his right, is snapped in two, and his helmet has fallen from his head. With half a sword, with a splintered shield, without a helmet—how can he, old warrior as he is, win the field? What can he do but die? Let us in our great battle of life remember this, and if we would overcome, let us take the *whole* armor of God—the shield, the breastplate, the helmet, and the sword. So shall we fight; so shall we be more than conquerors; and the God of peace shall bruise Satan under our feet shortly.

The day of error will not always last. The day of truth is coming. For we know that though in the last days perilous times shall come; yet beyond these there is the splendor of the most glorious day that ever dawned upon the earth; for he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry. He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.—*London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.*

[1] See Jude 7; 2 Pet. 2: 6; 2 Thess. 1: 8-10.

HADES AND HEAVEN.

By Eld. James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y.

Two widely different theories concerning the present state of the dead are entertained among those Protestants who believe in the immortality of the soul. The most popular of these can scarcely be called a theory of the intermediate state, since it recognizes no middle condition, but at once assigns the newly disembodied soul to the highest heaven or to the lowest hell. This will appear from the statements of some of its most distinguished advocates. Dr. Adam Clarke, commenting on 2 Cor. 5: 6, says:

"The apostle gives no intimation of an intermediate state between being at home in the body and being present with the Lord."

Thomas Scott says:

"If our sins be forgiven and our hearts renewed unto holiness, *heaven will be the rest of our souls*, whilst our bodies will be secretly hid in the grave."[1]

Albert Barnes says:

"The Christian when he leaves the body is at once with the Lord Jesus."[2] "Our pious friends that have died are now happy. They are with God. A father, or mother, or friend, that may have left us, is there—there in perfect felicity."[3]

Prof. Bartlett says:

"It is taught in the New Testament, that not only the soul of the Christian *might*, but that it *would*, enter and enjoy the presence of Christ at death; and that the continuance of its life here in the body actually delays its enjoyment of Christ's immediate presence in glory."....."It is affirmed that the believer, upon the death of the body, actually does enter heavenly blessedness at once."[4]

A well known author, but recently deceased, says:

[1] Observations on Job 14. [2] Remarks on 2 Cor. 5. [3] Note on Matt. 22: 32.
[4] *Life and Death Eternal*, pp. 196, 199.

UMI

"The sainted dead *are already* before the throne, and serve God day and night in his temple."[1]

Benson has this note on Eccl. 12: 7:

"The soul of man, so called because of its spiritual or immaterial nature, shall return unto God, into his presence, and before his tribunal, THAT *it may there be* SENTENCED TO ITS EVERLASTING HABITATION, either to abide with God forever if approved by him, or otherwise to be ETERNALLY SHUT OUT OF HIS PRESENCE AND FAVOR."

The state of the impenitent dead is thus described by President Edwards:

"As soon as ever the soul parts from the body, from that moment the case will be absolutely determined; there will then be an end forever to all hope, to everything that men hang upon this life; the soul then shall know certainly that it is to be miserable to all eternity without any remedy. It shall see that God is its enemy; it shall see its Judge clothed in his wrath and vengeance. Then its misery will begin, it will that moment be swallowed up in despair; the great gulf will be fixed between it and happiness, the door of mercy will be forever shut up, *the irrevocable sentence will be passed.*".... "We may well suppose that when a wicked man dies, his soul is seized by wicked angels; and that they are round his bed ready to seize the miserable soul as soon as it is parted from the body. And with what fierceness and fury do those cruel spirits fly upon their prey; and the soul shall be left in their hands! There shall be no good angels to guard and defend it. God will take no care of it; there is nothing to help it against those cruel spirits that shall lay hold of it, carry it to hell, *there to torment it forever.*"[2]

These extracts suffice to show that the theory under consideration renders the 'resurrection of the body' unnecessary, and the resurrection of *the dead* impossible; whilst it entirely ignores both the necessity and the fact of a judgment-day for the assembled world. The detention theory in a measure avoids both of these errors, by making the present state of the dead properly an *intermediate* state, both as respects the happiness of the righteous and the misery of the wicked. Its advocates uniformly represent the necessity of a resurrection of the body, and of a day of judgment. It may be stated thus: All souls when separated from the body at death go to *hades.* This 'spirit-world' is divided by an impassable gulf into two divisions called paradise

[1] H. Mattison. *Bible Doc. of Im.*, p. 35. [2] *Works*, vol. II., pp. 880-883.

and *tartarus.* All good souls go to paradise; all wicked souls go to *tartarus.* In these respective places they remain until the reunion of soul and body at the general resurrection, when the former will rise to higher joys in heaven, and the latter will sink to deeper misery in *gehenna.* Dr. Fitch, in his work on *The Intermediate State*, sums up the doctrine in these words:

"Now, of the things that I have spoken, this is the sum: At death, the body returns to the dust, as it was; the soul goes to the world of spirits, called by the general name of *hades;* the good to that happy part of it called paradise, where they are blessed; the bad are cast into outer darkness, where they are in torments."

The theory which assigns all souls immediately after death to their final destination in heaven or hell may not inaptly be termed radical; whilst that which allows of a detention in *hades* may as justly be termed conservative. Both of these theories claim the support of Scripture; both acknowledge the immateriality and immortality of the soul; both make heaven the final abode of the righteous; and both consign the wicked to endless misery in hell. Holding these points in common, neither party questions the 'orthodoxy' of the other.

It is interesting to observe with what ease each theory is in turn demolished by the advocates of the other. Mr. John Wesley was an able advocate of the conservative view. In his sermon on "Dives and Lazarus," he says:

"It is, indeed, very generally supposed, that the souls of good men, as soon as they are discharged from the body, go directly to heaven; but this opinion has not *the least foundation in the oracles of God.* On the contrary, our Lord says to Mary, after the resurrection, 'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father' in heaven. But he had been in paradise, according to his promise to the penitent thief: 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' Hence, it is plain that paradise is not heaven. It is, indeed (if we may be allowed the expression), the ante-chamber of heaven, where the souls of the righteous remain till, after the general judgment, they are received into glory."[1]

Admitting as the radicals do that Jesus and the penitent thief were together in paradise on the day of the crucifixion; and admitting as they do that *all* righteous souls go at death to this

[1] *Sermons*, vol. II., pp. 416-417.

UMI

"The sainted dead *are already* before the throne, and serve God day and night in his temple."[1]

Benson has this note on Eccl. 12: 7:

"The soul of man, so called because of its spiritual or immaterial nature, shall return unto God, into his presence, and before his tribunal, THAT *it may there be* SENTENCED TO ITS EVERLASTING HABITATION, either to abide with God forever if approved by him, or otherwise to be ETERNALLY SHUT OUT OF HIS PRESENCE AND FAVOR."

The state of the impenitent dead is thus described by President Edwards:

"As soon as ever the soul parts from the body, from that moment the case will be absolutely determined; there will then be an end forever to all hope, to everything that men hang upon this life; the soul then shall know certainly that it is to be miserable to all eternity without any remedy. It shall see that God is its enemy; it shall see its Judge clothed in his wrath and vengeance. Then its misery will begin, it will that moment be swallowed up in despair; the great gulf will be fixed between it and happiness, the door of mercy will be forever shut up, *the irrevocable sentence will be passed.*".... "We may well suppose that when a wicked man dies, his soul is seized by wicked angels; and that they are round his bed ready to seize the miserable soul as soon as it is parted from the body. And with what fierceness and fury do those cruel spirits fly upon their prey; and the soul shall be left in their hands! There shall be no good angels to guard and defend it. God will take no care of it; there is nothing to help it against those cruel spirits that shall lay hold of it, carry it to hell, *there to torment it forever.*"[2]

These extracts suffice to show that the theory under consideration renders the 'resurrection of the body' unnecessary, and the resurrection of *the dead* impossible; whilst it entirely ignores both the necessity and the fact of a judgment-day for the assembled world. The detention theory in a measure avoids both of these errors, by making the present state of the dead properly an *intermediate* state, both as respects the happiness of the righteous and the misery of the wicked. Its advocates uniformly represent the necessity of a resurrection of the body, and of a day of judgment. It may be stated thus: All souls when separated from the body at death go to *hades.* This 'spirit-world' is divided by an impassable gulf into two divisions called paradise

[1] H. Mattison. *Bible Doc. of Im.*, p. 35. [2] *Works*, vol. II., pp. 880-883.

and *tartarus.* All good souls go to paradise; all wicked souls go to *tartarus.* In these respective places they remain until the reunion of soul and body at the general resurrection, when the former will rise to higher joys in heaven, and the latter will sink to deeper misery in *gehenna.* Dr. Fitch, in his work on *The Intermediate State*, sums up the doctrine in these words:

"Now, of the things that I have spoken, this is the sum: At death, the body returns to the dust, as it was; the soul goes to the world of spirits, called by the general name of *hades;* the good to that happy part of it called paradise, where they are blessed; the bad are cast into outer darkness, where they are in torments."

The theory which assigns all souls immediately after death to their final destination in heaven or hell may not inaptly be termed radical; whilst that which allows of a detention in *hades* may as justly be termed conservative. Both of these theories claim the support of Scripture; both acknowledge the immateriality and immortality of the soul; both make heaven the final abode of the righteous; and both consign the wicked to endless misery in hell. Holding these points in common, neither party questions the 'orthodoxy' of the other.

It is interesting to observe with what ease each theory is in turn demolished by the advocates of the other. Mr. John Wesley was an able advocate of the conservative view. In his sermon on "Dives and Lazarus," he says:

"It is, indeed, very generally supposed, that the souls of good men, as soon as they are discharged from the body, go directly to heaven; but this opinion has not *the least foundation in the oracles of God.* On the contrary, our Lord says to Mary, after the resurrection, 'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father' in heaven. But he had been in paradise, according to his promise to the penitent thief: 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' Hence, it is plain that paradise is not heaven. It is, indeed (if we may be allowed the expression), the ante-chamber of heaven, where the souls of the righteous remain till, after the general judgment, they are received into glory."[1]

Admitting as the radicals do that Jesus and the penitent thief were together in paradise on the day of the crucifixion; and admitting as they do that *all* righteous souls go at death to this

[1] *Sermons*, vol. II., pp. 416-417.

UMI

same paradise, the argument urged by Mr. Wesley against their theory is unanswerable and irresistible.

A recent writer in advocating the conservative theory, after quoting Acts 2: 34, says:

"David, the man after God's own heart, hath not yet ascended into heaven. We should, then, conclude that none others had. This, Christ says, is true. John 3: 13: 'No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man.' *The dead, then, are not yet in heaven*.... If David hath not ascended to heaven—if no man but Christ hath ascended to heaven—if Christ had been in paradise, but had not been in heaven (when Mary met him at the sepulcher), then paradise is not heaven. The penitent thief went to paradise, but not to heaven. The place to which the souls of the righteous go at death is not heaven." [1]

The argument as against the radical theory is a good one. Arguing from the admitted premises of both parties, the conclusion reached cannot be logically avoided. But in any event the possible triumph of the conservatives is but a partial one. They have indeed succeeded in overthrowing the radical theory, without making any advance toward sustaining their own. They must first establish their premises before we grant their conclusion.

On the other hand, the radical, in replying to the conservative's argument, demolishes the latter's theory without strengthening his own. He cites Luke 23: 43 as proof that the righteous go to heaven when they die. "The passage does not prove this," replies the conservative. "It proves rather that the righteous go at death to be with Christ in paradise. He said to the thief, 'Thou shalt be with me in paradise,' not in heaven." "Where is paradise?" asks the radical. "In *hades*," is the reply. "Those who mistake paradise for *heaven*, and *hades* for *hell*, may be perplexed to reconcile the two expressions of our Lord, 'To day shalt thou be with me in paradise,' and, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*.' There is no contradiction. He was in that part of *hades* which is called paradise. *America* is the general name of all this Western Continent, but *United States* is the happy part of America. So *hades* is the name of all the spirit-world, but paradise is the blessed part of that spirit-world." [2]

To this the radical replies: "This does not meet my objection

[1] C. W. Fitch. *The Intermediate State*, pp. 20, 21. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 27, 28.

to your theory. This question of *hades*, and its alleged divisions, is entirely foreign to the subject, and must be separately discussed. My argument may be stated thus:

"All the righteous when they die go to be with Christ;

"But Christ is in heaven;

"Therefore the righteous when they die go to heaven.

"You admit the major premise, and I am prepared to sustain the minor term by express assertions of Scripture. 'Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *but into heaven itself*, now to appear in the presence of God for us.' [1] 'Our conversation is in heaven; *from whence* also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.' [2] Stephen 'looked up steadfastly *into heaven*, and saw the glory of God, *and Jesus* standing on the right hand of God.' [3] 'The Lord himself shall descend *from heaven* with a shout.' [4] 'Your *Master also is in heaven*.' [5] '*Jesus Christ is gone into heaven*, and is on the right hand of God.' [6]

"These passages are decisive of the point in question; and the first two propositions being thus established, the conclusion inevitably follows, that the righteous when they die go to heaven."

The conservative cannot meet this argument, unless he can show that Christ is personally in *hades*, or there in the same sense that he is in heaven. This he cannot do; and his theory, therefore, fails.

Nor need the radicals confine their objections to a single passage. There are many other texts, quoted and relied upon alike by both parties, that—reasoning from the major premise as above—make directly against the detention of souls in *hades*. For instance: Eccl. 12: 7 is said to mean that at death the *soul* goes to God who gave it. But God is in heaven, whilst the conservatives say that the soul does not go at first to heaven but to *hades*. Again, Phil. 1: 21–23 is said to prove that all the righteous go at death to be with Christ. But Christ is in heaven, whilst the paradise of the conservatives is not in heaven, but in *hades*.

If, now, the advocates of these theories should say to the writer, Since you claim that we have overthrown each other's position concerning the state of the dead, perhaps you will oblige us by stating the true doctrine, he would reply: The true doc-

[1] Heb. 9: 24. [2] Phil. 3: 20. [3] Acts 7: 55. [4] 1 Thess. 4: 16. [5] Eph. 6: 9; Col. 4: 1. [6] 1 Pet. 3: 22.

UMI

same paradise, the argument urged by Mr. Wesley against their theory is unanswerable and irresistible.

A recent writer in advocating the conservative theory, after quoting Acts 2: 34, says:

"David, the man after God's own heart, hath not yet ascended into heaven. We should, then, conclude that none others had. This, Christ says, is true. John 3: 13: 'No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man.' *The dead, then, are not yet in heaven*.... If David hath not ascended to heaven—if no man but Christ hath ascended to heaven—if Christ had been in paradise, but had not been in heaven (when Mary met him at the sepulcher), then paradise is not heaven. The penitent thief went to paradise, but not to heaven. The place to which the souls of the righteous go at death is not heaven." [1]

The argument as against the radical theory is a good one. Arguing from the admitted premises of both parties, the conclusion reached cannot be logically avoided. But in any event the possible triumph of the conservatives is but a partial one. They have indeed succeeded in overthrowing the radical theory, without making any advance toward sustaining their own. They must first establish their premises before we grant their conclusion.

On the other hand, the radical, in replying to the conservative's argument, demolishes the latter's theory without strengthening his own. He cites Luke 23: 43 as proof that the righteous go to heaven when they die. "The passage does not prove this," replies the conservative. "It proves rather that the righteous go at death to be with Christ in paradise. He said to the thief, 'Thou shalt be with me in paradise,' not in heaven." "Where is paradise?" asks the radical. "In *hades*," is the reply. "Those who mistake paradise for *heaven*, and *hades* for *hell*, may be perplexed to reconcile the two expressions of our Lord, 'To day shalt thou be with me in paradise,' and, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*.' There is no contradiction. He was in that part of *hades* which is called paradise. *America* is the general name of all this Western Continent, but *United States* is the happy part of America. So *hades* is the name of all the spirit-world, but paradise is the blessed part of that spirit-world." [2]

To this the radical replies: "This does not meet my objection

[1] C. W. Fitch. *The Intermediate State*, pp. 20, 21. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 27, 28.

to your theory. This question of *hades*, and its alleged divisions, is entirely foreign to the subject, and must be separately discussed. My argument may be stated thus:

"All the righteous when they die go to be with Christ;

"But Christ is in heaven;

"Therefore the righteous when they die go to heaven.

"You admit the major premise, and I am prepared to sustain the minor term by express assertions of Scripture. 'Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *but into heaven itself*, now to appear in the presence of God for us.' [1] 'Our conversation is in heaven; *from whence* also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.' [2] Stephen 'looked up steadfastly *into heaven*, and saw the glory of God, *and Jesus* standing on the right hand of God.' [3] 'The Lord himself shall descend *from heaven* with a shout.' [4] 'Your *Master also is in heaven*.' [5] '*Jesus Christ is gone into heaven*, and is on the right hand of God.' [6]

"These passages are decisive of the point in question; and the first two propositions being thus established, the conclusion inevitably follows, that the righteous when they die go to heaven."

The conservative cannot meet this argument, unless he can show that Christ is personally in *hades*, or there in the same sense that he is in heaven. This he cannot do; and his theory, therefore, fails.

Nor need the radicals confine their objections to a single passage. There are many other texts, quoted and relied upon alike by both parties, that—reasoning from the major premise as above—make directly against the detention of souls in *hades*. For instance: Eccl. 12: 7 is said to mean that at death the *soul* goes to God who gave it. But God is in heaven, whilst the conservatives say that the soul does not go at first to heaven but to *hades*. Again, Phil. 1: 21–23 is said to prove that all the righteous go at death to be with Christ. But Christ is in heaven, whilst the paradise of the conservatives is not in heaven, but in *hades*.

If, now, the advocates of these theories should say to the writer, Since you claim that we have overthrown each other's position concerning the state of the dead, perhaps you will oblige us by stating the true doctrine, he would reply: The true doc-

[1] Heb. 9: 24. [2] Phil. 3: 20. [3] Acts 7: 55. [4] 1 Thess. 4: 16. [5] Eph. 6: 9; Col. 4: 1. [6] 1 Pet. 3: 22.

UMI

trine is that of the Bible, which plainly teaches that the dead are asleep;[1] that they praise not the Lord;[2] that they are "in the land of forgetfulness;"[3] that they cannot hope for God's truth;[4] that "they know not anything."[5]

This theory is expressed in the language of Scripture, and therefore the burden of disproof lies with the party objecting thereto. Neither of the other theories is expressed in Scriptural terms. Where in the Bible can we find the doctrine stated that the righteous when they die go to heaven, or to a paradise in *hades?* Where in that sacred book are we told that when a wicked man dies his soul is seized by wicked angels and carried to hell, there to be tormented forever? Where is the divine authority for saying that the human soul is immaterial, or immortal, or that it is ever judged or rewarded or punished separate from the body? Where in the Holy Scriptures is it written that "the sainted dead are already before the throne and serve God day and night in his temple?" Can there be found in the whole Bible a single passage that teaches either directly or indirectly, by express assertion or fair implication, the incredible and truly intolerable doctrine, that all the wicked dead are at the present time tormented by wicked angels in some fearful abode of endless and ever-increasing misery?

The lovers of Bible truth have a right to demand that these questions be answered. I know very well the passages of Scripture that the radicals and conservatives cite as proof of their respective theories; and I know too that not one of them has the slightest relevance to the subject under discussion. The question is, What is the present state or condition of the dead? What do the Scriptures teach concerning it? Neither party has a right to begin the investigation of this question by *assuming as true* any disputed doctrine whatever. Let it be understood, then, that neither party has the right to *assume* that man is mortal or immortal, that the dead are conscious or unconscious. To do this would be equivalent to begging the question at the outset. Let the appeal, then, be made to those passages of Scripture in which the state of the dead is made the subject of comment or remark.

The testimony of Job concerning the intermediate state is very

[1] 1 Cor. 11:30; 15:6, 18, 51; 1 Thess. 4:13, 14, 15; 5:10; Ps. 13:3; 17:15; Is. 26:19; Dan. 12:2. [2] Ps. 115:17. [3] Ps. 88:12. [4] Is. 38:18. [5] Eccl. 9:5.

explicit. In the fourteenth chapter of his wonderful poem he declares that—

> "Man dieth, and wasteth away;
> Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
> *As* the waters fail from the sea,
> And the flood decayeth and drieth up:
> *So man lieth down, and riseth not:*
> *Till the heavens be no more,*[1]
> *They shall not awake,*
> *Nor be raised out of their sleep.*"

No comment could add force or clearness to this impressive passage of Scripture, in which it is expressly asserted that *the dead are asleep* and unable to *awake* therefrom until "the heavens be no more." Two other passages may, however, be appropriately quoted in this connection. In the closing chapter of Daniel's prophecy it is written: "Many of *them that sleep* in the dust of the earth shall *awake*, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Will it be said that this refers only to the state of dead *bodies* since the *soul* never sleeps? What then is meant by Isaiah's declaration—"Thy dead *men* shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. *Awake* and sing, ye that dwell in dust!"[2]

If it be true that the righteous go directly to heaven at death, or even to a paradise in *hades*, it is passing strange that not one of the inspired writers has ever mentioned the fact, either as an incentive to virtue, or as a consolation to surviving friends and relatives. Throughout the New Testament the interval between this life and the next, between this world and the world to come, is passed over as if it were nothing. Our Lord never speaks of a 'spirit-world,' and never promises a reward to any until his second advent. In reasoning with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection, he speaks of "the children of *this* world," and of them "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that* world," but says not a word about any world *between* death and resurrection. To one who had invited him to eat bread on the Sabbath, he said: "When thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for *thou shalt be recompensed* AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST."[3] If either of the orthodox theories were true, why did not the Great Teacher say, 'Thou shalt be recompensed at death?' This would have settled the whole question

[1] See 2 Pet. 3:10; Rev. 6:14; 21:1. [2] Is. 26:19. [3] Luke 14:13, 14.

trine is that of the Bible, which plainly teaches that the dead are asleep;[1] that they praise not the Lord;[2] that they are "in the land of forgetfulness;"[3] that they cannot hope for God's truth;[4] that "they know not anything."[5]

This theory is expressed in the language of Scripture, and therefore the burden of disproof lies with the party objecting thereto. Neither of the other theories is expressed in Scriptural terms. Where in the Bible can we find the doctrine stated that the righteous when they die go to heaven, or to a paradise in *hades?* Where in that sacred book are we told that when a wicked man dies his soul is seized by wicked angels and carried to hell, there to be tormented forever? Where is the divine authority for saying that the human soul is immaterial, or immortal, or that it is ever judged or rewarded or punished separate from the body? Where in the Holy Scriptures is it written that "the sainted dead are already before the throne and serve God day and night in his temple?" Can there be found in the whole Bible a single passage that teaches either directly or indirectly, by express assertion or fair implication, the incredible and truly intolerable doctrine, that all the wicked dead are at the present time tormented by wicked angels in some fearful abode of endless and ever-increasing misery?

The lovers of Bible truth have a right to demand that these questions be answered. I know very well the passages of Scripture that the radicals and conservatives cite as proof of their respective theories; and I know too that not one of them has the slightest relevance to the subject under discussion. The question is, What is the present state or condition of the dead? What do the Scriptures teach concerning it? Neither party has a right to begin the investigation of this question by *assuming as true* any disputed doctrine whatever. Let it be understood, then, that neither party has the right to *assume* that man is mortal or immortal, that the dead are conscious or unconscious. To do this would be equivalent to begging the question at the outset. Let the appeal, then, be made to those passages of Scripture in which the state of the dead is made the subject of comment or remark.

The testimony of Job concerning the intermediate state is very

[1] 1 Cor. 11:30; 15:6, 18, 51; 1 Thess. 4:13, 14, 15; 5:10; Ps. 13:3; 17:15; Is. 26:19; Dan. 12:2. [2] Ps. 115:17. [3] Ps. 88:12. [4] Is. 38:18. [5] Eccl. 9:5.

explicit. In the fourteenth chapter of his wonderful poem he declares that—

> "Man dieth, and wasteth away;
> Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
> *As* the waters fail from the sea,
> And the flood decayeth and drieth up:
> *So man lieth down, and riseth not:*
> *Till the heavens be no more,*[1]
> *They shall not awake,*
> *Nor be raised out of their sleep.*"

No comment could add force or clearness to this impressive passage of Scripture, in which it is expressly asserted that *the dead are asleep* and unable to *awake* therefrom until "the heavens be no more." Two other passages may, however, be appropriately quoted in this connection. In the closing chapter of Daniel's prophecy it is written: "Many of *them that sleep* in the dust of the earth shall *awake*, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Will it be said that this refers only to the state of dead *bodies* since the *soul* never sleeps? What then is meant by Isaiah's declaration—"Thy dead *men* shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. *Awake* and sing, ye that dwell in dust!"[2]

If it be true that the righteous go directly to heaven at death, or even to a paradise in *hades*, it is passing strange that not one of the inspired writers has ever mentioned the fact, either as an incentive to virtue, or as a consolation to surviving friends and relatives. Throughout the New Testament the interval between this life and the next, between this world and the world to come, is passed over as if it were nothing. Our Lord never speaks of a 'spirit-world,' and never promises a reward to any until his second advent. In reasoning with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection, he speaks of "the children of *this* world," and of them "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that* world," but says not a word about any world *between* death and resurrection. To one who had invited him to eat bread on the Sabbath, he said: "When thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for *thou shalt be recompensed* AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST."[3] If either of the orthodox theories were true, why did not the Great Teacher say, 'Thou shalt be recompensed at death?' This would have settled the whole question

[1] See 2 Pet. 3:10; Rev. 6:14; 21:1. [2] Is. 26:19. [3] Luke 14:13, 14.

at once. His words however as given by Luke, ought to decide the disputed point with all who believe the Bible, that the righteous are not recompensed until the resurrection of the just.

When Paul would administer consolation to the mourning ones at Thessalonica, he was not permitted "by the word of the Lord" to assure them that their deceased brethren were at that very moment partaking of the joys of heaven or paradise, and

"Drinking fresh draughts of endless pleasure in."

He was not permitted to sing with Dr. Watts—

"Why do ye mourn departing friends,
Or shake at death's alarms?
'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends
To call them to his arms."

Nor to indulge in the sentiment of Montgomery, who asks:

"Why mourn the pious dead?
Why sorrows swell our eyes?
* * * * * * * * *
In heaven the ransomed soul is seen."

It was permitted him, however, and that too by divine authority, to address to his bereaved brethren words which cheered their saddened hearts, and which have ever since been the source of comfort and consolation to millions of mourners in every Christian land. He begins by saying that he would not have them ignorant "concerning *them which sleep.*" "For," said he, "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so *them* also *which sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [go before] *them which are asleep.* For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the *dead in Christ* shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and *so* shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." [1]

Neither of the orthodox theories can be made to harmonize with the plain utterances of this most perspicuous passage. There are three points of marked contrast which should be carefully noted:

[1] 1 Thess. 4: 14-18.

1. The Apostle describes the dead as "*them which are asleep.*" Orthodoxy represents them as wide awake.

2. The Apostle represents the Lord as coming from heaven to receive all his saints both living and dead. Orthodoxy represents the saints as going one by one to the Lord in heaven.

3. Paul says: "*The dead* in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain [unto the coming of the Lord] shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall *we* ever be with the Lord." Orthodoxy says: 'The sainted dead are *already* before the throne, and serve God day and night in his temple.' [1]

Paul passes without remark over the intermediate state, and fixes all his hopes upon the second coming of Christ to raise the dead. In his first letter to the Corinthians he teaches the same doctrine in these words: "If the dead rise not,....then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."...."What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink: for to-morrow we die." [2] Here the doctrine is plainly taught, that without a resurrection there can be no future life for the dead. But this cannot be true in any sense, if the righteous at death are admitted into the joys of heaven or paradise. For in such a case it is evident that it would matter quite as much how we passed the time of our probation here, as though we had to attain future life through a resurrection from the dead. The statements of the apostle and the theories of orthodox Protestants are thus seen to be irreconcilable. The doctrine of the sleep of the dead rests upon the firm foundation of the Gospel.

Aside from the main question, there are several collateral points to be considered, which constitute very grave objections to the orthodox theories. What we have called the radical view practically nullifies the doctrine of the resurrection by representing that the soul at death is invested with its appropriate spiritual body, in which it then ascends to heaven. It has long been taught in theological schools that all the dead are now existing as *disembodied* and *immaterial* souls. But this shadowy notion is fast giving way to the more substantial theory that each soul is at death clothed upon with its own appropriate body. Prof. Bush, who holds that the resurrection or *anastasis* of each individual takes place at death, is not accounted orthodox. But Mr. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, who is an orthodox radical

[1] *Bible Doc. of Im.*, p. 35. [2] 1 Cor. 15: 18, 32.

UMI

at once. His words however as given by Luke, ought to decide the disputed point with all who believe the Bible, that the righteous are not recompensed until the resurrection of the just.

When Paul would administer consolation to the mourning ones at Thessalonica, he was not permitted "by the word of the Lord" to assure them that their deceased brethren were at that very moment partaking of the joys of heaven or paradise, and

"Drinking fresh draughts of endless pleasure in."

He was not permitted to sing with Dr. Watts—

"Why do ye mourn departing friends,
Or shake at death's alarms?
'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends
To call them to his arms."

Nor to indulge in the sentiment of Montgomery, who asks:

"Why mourn the pious dead?
Why sorrows swell our eyes?
* * * * * * * * *
In heaven the ransomed soul is seen."

It was permitted him, however, and that too by divine authority, to address to his bereaved brethren words which cheered their saddened hearts, and which have ever since been the source of comfort and consolation to millions of mourners in every Christian land. He begins by saying that he would not have them ignorant "concerning *them which sleep.*" "For," said he, "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so *them* also *which sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [go before] *them which are asleep.* For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the *dead in Christ* shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and *so* shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." [1]

Neither of the orthodox theories can be made to harmonize with the plain utterances of this most perspicuous passage. There are three points of marked contrast which should be carefully noted:

[1] 1 Thess. 4: 14-18.

1. The Apostle describes the dead as "*them which are asleep.*" Orthodoxy represents them as wide awake.

2. The Apostle represents the Lord as coming from heaven to receive all his saints both living and dead. Orthodoxy represents the saints as going one by one to the Lord in heaven.

3. Paul says: "*The dead* in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain [unto the coming of the Lord] shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall *we* ever be with the Lord." Orthodoxy says: 'The sainted dead are *already* before the throne, and serve God day and night in his temple.' [1]

Paul passes without remark over the intermediate state, and fixes all his hopes upon the second coming of Christ to raise the dead. In his first letter to the Corinthians he teaches the same doctrine in these words: "If the dead rise not,....then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."...."What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink: for to-morrow we die." [2] Here the doctrine is plainly taught, that without a resurrection there can be no future life for the dead. But this cannot be true in any sense, if the righteous at death are admitted into the joys of heaven or paradise. For in such a case it is evident that it would matter quite as much how we passed the time of our probation here, as though we had to attain future life through a resurrection from the dead. The statements of the apostle and the theories of orthodox Protestants are thus seen to be irreconcilable. The doctrine of the sleep of the dead rests upon the firm foundation of the Gospel.

Aside from the main question, there are several collateral points to be considered, which constitute very grave objections to the orthodox theories. What we have called the radical view practically nullifies the doctrine of the resurrection by representing that the soul at death is invested with its appropriate spiritual body, in which it then ascends to heaven. It has long been taught in theological schools that all the dead are now existing as *disembodied* and *immaterial* souls. But this shadowy notion is fast giving way to the more substantial theory that each soul is at death clothed upon with its own appropriate body. Prof. Bush, who holds that the resurrection or *anastasis* of each individual takes place at death, is not accounted orthodox. But Mr. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, who is an orthodox radical

[1] *Bible Doc. of Im.*, p. 35. [2] 1 Cor. 15: 18, 32.

UMI

of the most approved stamp, has the boldness in his notes on 2 Cor. 5, to state the doctrine thus:

"The phrase 'to be clothed upon with our house' seems to be harsh and unusual. The sense is plain, however, that Paul desired to be invested with that pure, spiritual, and undecaying body which was to be the eternal abode of his soul in heaven. . . . The word 'clothed' refers to the spiritual body of believers; the eternal habitation in which they shall reside. In that future state *the soul will not be naked; i. e.*, destitute of any body or covering. The present body will be laid aside. It will return to corruption, and the disembodied spirit will ascend to God and to heaven. It will be disencumbered of the body with which it has so long been clothed. But we are not thence to infer that it will be destitute of a body; that it will remain a naked soul. It will be *clothed* there in its appropriate glorified body: and will have an appropriate habitation there. 'But clothed upon.' To be invested with our spiritual body. We desire to be clothed with that body."

Now this sounds like a very different gospel from that which Paul preached. If every Christian is invested at death with a spiritual body, which is to be "*the eternal abode of his soul in heaven*," what becomes of the doctrine of the resurrection? If the righteous dead are *already* in heaven; if they are *already* in the presence of God where there is fullness of joy, and pleasures for evermore; if they are *already* clothed with spiritual bodies; if they have *already* entered upon their reward, and are *already* equal unto the angels, the resurrection and the judgment-day are, to them, as though they had already been, or never were to be.

There is something extremely awkward, not to say absurd, in the notion that beings who have long since entered on a state of happiness or misery are to come from those abodes to be judged, and then to receive a formal award to the very condition which has long been familiar to them. To be in heaven or hell for ages, and then to stand at the judgment-seat of Christ to be judged; to hear the welcome—"Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," addressed to a class who had already entered upon their inheritance; to hear the dread sentence—"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," addressed to a class who had already entered upon their punishment, scarcely looks consistent, but has the appearance rather of a theological fiction which has not one syllable in Scripture to give it countenance. Such representations—come from what source they may—seem but little better than mockeries of the most solemn scenes of future retribution.

Let it be understood, then, that the radical theory as stated by Mr. Barnes is irreconcilably opposed to the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection. Dr. Carmichael has plainly but truthfully observed: "It cannot be too often repeated: If there be an immortal soul there is no resurrection; and if there be any resurrection there is no immortal soul." [1]

Modern Spiritualism is commonly thought to be false in theory and pernicious in practice, yet its chief corner-stone and that of Protestant orthodoxy is the same. The immortality of the soul is a fundamental doctrine in the creed of each. The orthodox as well as the heterodox Spiritualism of the nineteenth century denies the necessity of a resurrection of the dead to enable them to communicate with the living. Dr. Fitch, a learned and venerable clergyman of the Episcopal church, in a recent work says:

"Abraham did not say it was because there was an impassable gulf betwixt the spirits of the just and the children of God in this world. There is *no such barrier*. . . . Blessed spirits departed *can revisit* the blessed on earth.

'When spirits made perfect meet spirits on earth,
'Tis good to be there.'

The souls of the departed do exist—shall we not say in angel form?—and do sometimes act as ministering spirits, sent forth to 'minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation.'" [2]

The Scriptures nowhere give the least countenance to *this* kind of Spiritualism, nor do they contain a promise to the righteous that they shall, in the intermediate state, be equal unto the angels. Our Lord said to the Sadducees: "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and *the resurrection from the dead*, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more: for *they* are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, BEING THE CHILDREN OF THE RESURRECTION." It is at the resurrection, then, and not at death, that the righteous are to be equal unto the angels. Then shall mortality be swallowed up of life; then shall this mortal put on immortality; then shall David awake and be satisfied, and then shall all the saints triumphantly shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O *hades*, where is thy victory?"

[1] *Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture*, vol. II., p. 315.
[2] *The Intermediate State*, pp. 11, 12.

of the most approved stamp, has the boldness in his notes on 2 Cor. 5, to state the doctrine thus:

"The phrase 'to be clothed upon with our house' seems to be harsh and unusual. The sense is plain, however, that Paul desired to be invested with that pure, spiritual, and undecaying body which was to be the eternal abode of his soul in heaven. . . . The word 'clothed' refers to the spiritual body of believers; the eternal habitation in which they shall reside. In that future state *the soul will not be naked; i. e.*, destitute of any body or covering. The present body will be laid aside. It will return to corruption, and the disembodied spirit will ascend to God and to heaven. It will be disencumbered of the body with which it has so long been clothed. But we are not thence to infer that it will be destitute of a body; that it will remain a naked soul. It will be *clothed* there in its appropriate glorified body: and will have an appropriate habitation there. 'But clothed upon.' To be invested with our spiritual body. We desire to be clothed with that body."

Now this sounds like a very different gospel from that which Paul preached. If every Christian is invested at death with a spiritual body, which is to be "*the eternal abode of his soul in heaven*," what becomes of the doctrine of the resurrection? If the righteous dead are *already* in heaven; if they are *already* in the presence of God where there is fullness of joy, and pleasures for evermore; if they are *already* clothed with spiritual bodies; if they have *already* entered upon their reward, and are *already* equal unto the angels, the resurrection and the judgment-day are, to them, as though they had already been, or never were to be.

There is something extremely awkward, not to say absurd, in the notion that beings who have long since entered on a state of happiness or misery are to come from those abodes to be judged, and then to receive a formal award to the very condition which has long been familiar to them. To be in heaven or hell for ages, and then to stand at the judgment-seat of Christ to be judged; to hear the welcome—"Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," addressed to a class who had already entered upon their inheritance; to hear the dread sentence—"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," addressed to a class who had already entered upon their punishment, scarcely looks consistent, but has the appearance rather of a theological fiction which has not one syllable in Scripture to give it countenance. Such representations—come from what source they may—seem but little better than mockeries of the most solemn scenes of future retribution.

Let it be understood, then, that the radical theory as stated by Mr. Barnes is irreconcilably opposed to the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection. Dr. Carmichael has plainly but truthfully observed: "It cannot be too often repeated: If there be an immortal soul there is no resurrection; and if there be any resurrection there is no immortal soul." [1]

Modern Spiritualism is commonly thought to be false in theory and pernicious in practice, yet its chief corner-stone and that of Protestant orthodoxy is the same. The immortality of the soul is a fundamental doctrine in the creed of each. The orthodox as well as the heterodox Spiritualism of the nineteenth century denies the necessity of a resurrection of the dead to enable them to communicate with the living. Dr. Fitch, a learned and venerable clergyman of the Episcopal church, in a recent work says:

"Abraham did not say it was because there was an impassable gulf betwixt the spirits of the just and the children of God in this world. There is *no such barrier*. . . . Blessed spirits departed *can revisit* the blessed on earth.

'When spirits made perfect meet spirits on earth,
'Tis good to be there.'

The souls of the departed do exist—shall we not say in angel form?—and do sometimes act as ministering spirits, sent forth to 'minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation.'" [2]

The Scriptures nowhere give the least countenance to *this* kind of Spiritualism, nor do they contain a promise to the righteous that they shall, in the intermediate state, be equal unto the angels. Our Lord said to the Sadducees: "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and *the resurrection from the dead*, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more: for *they* are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, BEING THE CHILDREN OF THE RESURRECTION." It is at the resurrection, then, and not at death, that the righteous are to be equal unto the angels. Then shall mortality be swallowed up of life; then shall this mortal put on immortality; then shall David awake and be satisfied, and then shall all the saints triumphantly shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O *hades*, where is thy victory?"

[1] *Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture*, vol. II., p. 315.
[2] *The Intermediate State*, pp. 11, 12.

The dead are not praising God in heaven, nor cursing him in hell. They are asleep. They take no note of passing time. The voice of sorrow and the greetings of joy are alike unheeded by the inhabitants of the land of silence. The busy hum of industry and the ceaseless activities of life move on above them, but to them all is silent and unseen. The earthquake's shock and the thunder's roar send no sound within their narrow cell.

"The storm that wrecks the winter sky,
No more disturbs their deep repose
Than summer evening's latest sigh
That shuts the rose."

The flight of time can no longer be perceived by the senses, for the ear is deaf and the eye is closed. The silent sleepers are at rest. Earth's commotions, the march of mighty armies and the rise and fall of empires are unheeded by those who sleep in the dust. With them, joy and sorrow, love and hatred, no longer contend for the mastery. In the land of forgetfulness the miser no longer remembers his avarice, nor the conqueror his ambition. There are no inequalities of station there. The emperor and the serf, the king and the peasant, the rich and the poor, the haughty and the humble, share alike the cold hospitality of the grave.

"There the wicked cease from troubling;
And there the weary be at rest.
There the prisoners rest together;
They hear not the voice of the oppressor.
The small and the great are there;
And the servant is free from his master."[1]

[1] Job 3: 17-19.

CAN THE EARTH CONTAIN ITS INHABITANTS, IF THEY ARE RESURRECTED?

The assertion is often ignorantly or carelessly made, that if all mankind since Adam should be resurrected, the earth would not contain them. It has even been published that the earth's surface has been dug over one hundred and twenty-eight times for graves; that if all the dead were raised they would be "sixteen deep" upon its surface; and an intelligent member of an orthodox church once stated to the writer, that the earth had not soil enough to reconstruct all the bodies that have been interred in its bosom.

We wish to place before our readers some simple calculations,

with the figures, that they may have continually at hand an effective means for confounding the skeptic or spiritualizer who may urge the stupid objection to our hope, that the earth is not large enough for the resurrection and judgment.

It is estimated that at the present time about 33,000,000 of persons die every year. For the sake of the argument, we will make no account of the years during which earth was peopled, after the Creation; and repeopled after the Deluge; but assume that for six thousand years, 33,000,000 have died every year. Here is the multiplication in figures:

	33,000,000
	6,000
	198,000,000,000
The highest estimate of the present population of the world is 1,200,000,000; but we will call it.....	2,000,000,000
This gives us a total of..... which is probably three times the number who have actually lived on the earth.	200,000,000,000
We next propose to find how much space these would occupy allowing each individual five square feet, and so multiply the above number by.....	5
	1,000,000,000,000

One trillion of square feet would furnish standing-room for all the vast multitude.

In the State of Michigan there are 56,243 square miles. In each square mile there are 27,878,400 square feet. Let us multiply again, omitting the odd hundreds in the square miles:

	27,878,400
	56,000
	167,170,400
And the multiplication gives us the number of square feet in the State of Michigan. Dividing this by five, the number of square feet allowed each individual, we shall find that this State alone would contain (persons).....	139,392,000
	5)1,561,090,400,000
	312,218,080,000

UMI

The dead are not praising God in heaven, nor cursing him in hell. They are asleep. They take no note of passing time. The voice of sorrow and the greetings of joy are alike unheeded by the inhabitants of the land of silence. The busy hum of industry and the ceaseless activities of life move on above them, but to them all is silent and unseen. The earthquake's shock and the thunder's roar send no sound within their narrow cell.

"The storm that wrecks the winter sky,
No more disturbs their deep repose
Than summer evening's latest sigh
That shuts the rose."

The flight of time can no longer be perceived by the senses, for the ear is deaf and the eye is closed. The silent sleepers are at rest. Earth's commotions, the march of mighty armies and the rise and fall of empires are unheeded by those who sleep in the dust. With them, joy and sorrow, love and hatred, no longer contend for the mastery. In the land of forgetfulness the miser no longer remembers his avarice, nor the conqueror his ambition. There are no inequalities of station there. The emperor and the serf, the king and the peasant, the rich and the poor, the haughty and the humble, share alike the cold hospitality of the grave.

"There the wicked cease from troubling;
And there the weary be at rest.
There the prisoners rest together;
They hear not the voice of the oppressor.
The small and the great are there;
And the servant is free from his master."[1]

[1] Job 3: 17-19.

CAN THE EARTH CONTAIN ITS INHABITANTS, IF THEY ARE RESURRECTED?

The assertion is often ignorantly or carelessly made, that if all mankind since Adam should be resurrected, the earth would not contain them. It has even been published that the earth's surface has been dug over one hundred and twenty-eight times for graves; that if all the dead were raised they would be "sixteen deep" upon its surface; and an intelligent member of an orthodox church once stated to the writer, that the earth had not soil enough to reconstruct all the bodies that have been interred in its bosom.

We wish to place before our readers some simple calculations,

with the figures, that they may have continually at hand an effective means for confounding the skeptic or spiritualizer who may urge the stupid objection to our hope, that the earth is not large enough for the resurrection and judgment.

It is estimated that at the present time about 33,000,000 of persons die every year. For the sake of the argument, we will make no account of the years during which earth was peopled, after the Creation; and repeopled after the Deluge; but assume that for six thousand years, 33,000,000 have died every year. Here is the multiplication in figures:

	33,000,000
	6,000
	198,000,000,000
The highest estimate of the present population of the world is 1,200,000,000; but we will call it.....	2,000,000,000
This gives us a total of..... which is probably three times the number who have actually lived on the earth.	200,000,000,000
We next propose to find how much space these would occupy allowing each individual five square feet, and so multiply the above number by.....	5
	1,000,000,000,000

One trillion of square feet would furnish standing-room for all the vast multitude.

In the State of Michigan there are 56,243 square miles. In each square mile there are 27,878,400 square feet. Let us multiply again, omitting the odd hundreds in the square miles:

	27,878,400
	56,000
	167,170,400
And the multiplication gives us the number of square feet in the State of Michigan. Dividing this by five, the number of square feet allowed each individual, we shall find that this State alone would contain (persons).....	139,392,000
	5)1,561,090,400,000
	312,218,080,000

UMI

or upwards of one hundred billions more than the above extravagant estimate of the entire race of Adam.

When we consider how every possible advantage is given to the skeptic in the above calculation, how exceedingly weak and foolish is the objection to the resurrection, that earth would not afford standing room for those who sleep in its dust. It can, we repeat, be urged only by the ignorant or the careless.

EDITORIAL.

THE promised work—*The Doctrine of Immortality*—by Eld. James H. Whitmore has been published, meets with a ready sale, and is received with great favor. It will take its place at once as a standard work, and must exert a lively and healthful influence in favor of the *Bible* doctrine of the nature of man and his future destiny. Our ministers, and others, can both help themselves and aid the cause of truth by engaging in the sale of this work. It is offered by the Association upon really liberal terms in order to secure for it the wide circulation it deserves. Do not be without a copy.

WE were requested to send a copy of the January number of THE QUARTERLY to the Rev. D. A. Whedon, D. D., of Bristol, R. I. The result was a new appeal to the prejudice we deprecated, made through the columns of *The Christian Advocate*. He calls us "Christian Sadducees." Now it is, of course, true that the Sadducees denied that there was in man "even a *mortal* immaterial soul or spirit which as a conscious entity survives in death." They denied "the existence of a soul distinct from the body." But does this justify Dr. Whedon in holding us up to his Methodist brethren as Christian Sadducees? This sect were frequently denounced by the Savior in unmeasured terms. The disciples were bid to beware of both their doctrine and morals; and their name is inseparably connected in the mind of the intelligent Christian with these stern denunciations. Therefore when a people are styled 'Christian Sadducees,' the associations connected with the epithet are such as are calculated to awaken the keenest prejudices against them. We will not affirm that Dr. Whedon thus stigmatized us with the conscious, deliberate intention of awaking a blind prejudice against Adventism in the minds of his readers. Certainly, if, as he affirms, the weight of argument is all on his side, he *need* not resort to such weapons. But a skillful appeal to *prejudice* in the very outset of an argument indicates reliance upon rhetoric rather than logic.

Let us examine the grounds upon which the charge that we are Sadducees rest. We will put it in the form of a syllogism.

The Sadducees denied the existence of the soul as a conscious entity distinct from the body;

Adventists deny the existence of the soul as a conscious entity distinct from the body;

Therefore, Adventists are Sadducees.

Now the above conclusion would be legitimate if the premises were fair: but they are *not* fair; for while the Sadducees believed, as Adventists do, that death is a state of unconsciousness, they also denied that there was either angel or spirit, resurrection of the dead, or future life for mankind, all of which Adventists steadfastly affirm. But let us apply the Doctor's method of reasoning to himself.

The Buddhists believe that man is conscious in death;

Dr. Whedon believes that man is conscious in death;

Therefore, Dr. Whedon is a Buddhist.

And we could go on in the same style of reasoning and prove him a Mohammedan, a Roman Catholic, a Pagan, a disciple of Zoroaster, of Confucius, of Plato, of Joe Smith, of Ann Lee, of Andrew Jackson Davis, and the Fox girls. Else he must claim that *his* is one of those rules which will not "work both ways;" and if so, he had best abandon its further use.

Of course it is useless for us to plead that the discussion of this question shall proceed upon its merits. Prof. Bartlett is not the only opponent we have who insists upon the use of certain terms as indispensable in attacking our views. Our assailants seemingly dare not risk their argument before intelligent men until they have first created the strongest possible bias against our, and in favor of their own views. On the other hand, whether acting on the defensive or the offensive, we have to meet not only whatever of logic they are able to summon; but are compelled to make our way against misrepresentations, misconceptions, the carefully fostered prejudices of education and association, intolerance, narrow-minded bigotry, and obstinate dogmatism. All these are arrayed against us; and our opposers show that they appreciate the effectiveness of such weapons by the free use they make of them.

Says Dr. Whedon: "It is not a little singular that a sect of self-styled Christians should have adopted the materialistic theory for whose sake infidels have rejected Christianity as incompatible with it, and pronounce it the genuine doctrine of Christianity itself."

This sentence is skillfully put: dissected, it is an assertion that Adventists teach the theory advanced by infidel materialists. And further on he says again that one might as well "talk of Christian Infidelity" as of "Christian Materialism." This amounts to an assertion that one *must be an immaterialist* or else be an infidel: to doubt immaterialism, is to deny Christianity. Again, we challenge the fairness and Christian courtesy of any opponent who will take advantage of the fact that *some* of an antagonist's positions are held by a school of infidels, and endeavor to confound his theory with that of the unbelievers. Which system of infidelity is making the most alarming inroads upon Christianity to-day: that of the materialist or the immaterialist schools? Suppose we should gravely charge the immaterialist Doctor with being a Spiritualist?—and the world has seen no worse form of infidelity. Yet he holds as many, or more articles of faith in common with them, than we do in common with the infidel materialists. Here again Dr. Whedon has taken his weapon by the blade; or we might say, thrown his 'boomerang' so unskillfully that it has returned upon his own pate.

UMI

or upwards of one hundred billions more than the above extravagant estimate of the entire race of Adam.

When we consider how every possible advantage is given to the skeptic in the above calculation, how exceedingly weak and foolish is the objection to the resurrection, that earth would not afford standing room for those who sleep in its dust. It can, we repeat, be urged only by the ignorant or the careless.

EDITORIAL.

THE promised work—*The Doctrine of Immortality*—by Eld. James H. Whitmore has been published, meets with a ready sale, and is received with great favor. It will take its place at once as a standard work, and must exert a lively and healthful influence in favor of the *Bible* doctrine of the nature of man and his future destiny. Our ministers, and others, can both help themselves and aid the cause of truth by engaging in the sale of this work. It is offered by the Association upon really liberal terms in order to secure for it the wide circulation it deserves. Do not be without a copy.

WE were requested to send a copy of the January number of THE QUARTERLY to the Rev. D. A. Whedon, D. D., of Bristol, R. I. The result was a new appeal to the prejudice we deprecated, made through the columns of *The Christian Advocate*. He calls us "Christian Sadducees." Now it is, of course, true that the Sadducees denied that there was in man "even a *mortal* immaterial soul or spirit which as a conscious entity survives in death." They denied "the existence of a soul distinct from the body." But does this justify Dr. Whedon in holding us up to his Methodist brethren as Christian Sadducees? This sect were frequently denounced by the Savior in unmeasured terms. The disciples were bid to beware of both their doctrine and morals; and their name is inseparably connected in the mind of the intelligent Christian with these stern denunciations. Therefore when a people are styled 'Christian Sadducees,' the associations connected with the epithet are such as are calculated to awaken the keenest prejudices against them. We will not affirm that Dr. Whedon thus stigmatized us with the conscious, deliberate intention of awaking a blind prejudice against Adventism in the minds of his readers. Certainly, if, as he affirms, the weight of argument is all on his side, he *need* not resort to such weapons. But a skillful appeal to *prejudice* in the very outset of an argument indicates reliance upon rhetoric rather than logic.

Let us examine the grounds upon which the charge that we are Sadducees rest. We will put it in the form of a syllogism.

The Sadducees denied the existence of the soul as a conscious entity distinct from the body;

Adventists deny the existence of the soul as a conscious entity distinct from the body;

Therefore, Adventists are Sadducees.

Now the above conclusion would be legitimate if the premises were fair: but they are *not* fair; for while the Sadducees believed, as Adventists do, that death is a state of unconsciousness, they also denied that there was either angel or spirit, resurrection of the dead, or future life for mankind, all of which Adventists steadfastly affirm. But let us apply the Doctor's method of reasoning to himself.

The Buddhists believe that man is conscious in death;

Dr. Whedon believes that man is conscious in death;

Therefore, Dr. Whedon is a Buddhist.

And we could go on in the same style of reasoning and prove him a Mohammedan, a Roman Catholic, a Pagan, a disciple of Zoroaster, of Confucius, of Plato, of Joe Smith, of Ann Lee, of Andrew Jackson Davis, and the Fox girls. Else he must claim that *his* is one of those rules which will not "work both ways;" and if so, he had best abandon its further use.

Of course it is useless for us to plead that the discussion of this question shall proceed upon its merits. Prof. Bartlett is not the only opponent we have who insists upon the use of certain terms as indispensable in attacking our views. Our assailants seemingly dare not risk their argument before intelligent men until they have first created the strongest possible bias against our, and in favor of their own views. On the other hand, whether acting on the defensive or the offensive, we have to meet not only whatever of logic they are able to summon; but are compelled to make our way against misrepresentations, misconceptions, the carefully fostered prejudices of education and association, intolerance, narrow-minded bigotry, and obstinate dogmatism. All these are arrayed against us; and our opposers show that they appreciate the effectiveness of such weapons by the free use they make of them.

Says Dr. Whedon: "It is not a little singular that a sect of self-styled Christians should have adopted the materialistic theory for whose sake infidels have rejected Christianity as incompatible with it, and pronounce it the genuine doctrine of Christianity itself."

This sentence is skillfully put: dissected, it is an assertion that Adventists teach the theory advanced by infidel materialists. And further on he says again that one might as well "talk of Christian Infidelity" as of "Christian Materialism." This amounts to an assertion that one *must be an immaterialist* or else be an infidel: to doubt immaterialism, is to deny Christianity. Again, we challenge the fairness and Christian courtesy of any opponent who will take advantage of the fact that *some* of an antagonist's positions are held by a school of infidels, and endeavor to confound his theory with that of the unbelievers. Which system of infidelity is making the most alarming inroads upon Christianity to-day: that of the materialist or the immaterialist schools? Suppose we should gravely charge the immaterialist Doctor with being a Spiritualist?—and the world has seen no worse form of infidelity. Yet he holds as many, or more articles of faith in common with them, than we do in common with the infidel materialists. Here again Dr. Whedon has taken his weapon by the blade; or we might say, thrown his 'boomerang' so unskillfully that it has returned upon his own pate.

UMI

Again he says: "In defining terms they [Adventists] sometimes say that spirit means *breath* when referring to man, and soul means animal life, or vital principle. This is sometimes true, and sometimes it is false, as in the passage, 'I pray God your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,' which becomes a prayer in behalf of the breath of the Thessalonians, consisting of oxygen and nitrogen inhaled and exhaled, their vital principle, and their bones and muscles, as if mere matter could be responsible."

Now Dr. Whedon has here placed himself in a dilemma, and must either plead ignorance or willful misrepresentation. He may seat himself on whichever of the two horns pleases him best. He has intimated that Adventists teach that spirit *always* means breath, and soul *always* means the vital principle; and the form of his charge, which, avoiding a direct statement, is still a clear intimation, indicates that the second horn of the dilemma in which he finds himself is his only choice: for no Adventist ever, any where (that we ever heard of), asserted what the Doctor intimates. They do assert, and prove, that the words soul and spirit have various meanings; and that, as in the case of any other word with primary and secondary significations, the context and sense of the passage determine their meaning in any given case. If the Doctor had said that Adventists "say—that *sometimes* spirit means breath," etc., he would have stated the exact truth, which he himself also must believe.

In the very next paragraph to the one quoted above, the Doctor says of the word "soul"—"under which term WE *include* what in Scripture psychology *is implied in both soul and spirit*." Now if he may take the liberty to include *soul* and *spirit* in one entity, can he reasonably complain if on the same principle we include *all three* in one entity, and understand Paul's prayer to be that the Thessalonians might in *their entire nature* be kept holy, or "preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord?" If the Doctor can prove that their nature included an immaterial immortal soul; intangible, indivisible, and without form, that of course will be included in the petition: but this text does not prove the existence of such an entity in the make-up of man. (Further remarks are crowded out.)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

NUMBER 1. An Apology, by Eld. Joshua V. Himes; Truth and Love—Letter to a Clergyman, by the Rev. Samuel Minton; Christianity vs. Churchianity, by Eld. A. A. Phelps; Paul's "Desire to Depart," by Thos. Davidson; The Kingdom of God, by Eld. L. C. Collins; An Approaching Change, from *The North British Review*; Life and Death, by Eld. James H. Whitmore; The Signs, by the Rev. Horatius Bonar; Editorial.

NUMBER 2. The Comforting Hope, by Eld. O. R. Fassett; First Things and First Thoughts on Awaking, Anon; Evening by Evening (Poetry), Bonar; The Trinity, by Eld. E. Royce; Has He Come? by Eld. Geo. Thomson; Missionary Theology, by the Rev. Edward White; The Second Advent, Selected; Editorial.

NUMBER 3. The Gospel Preached to Abraham, by the Editor; The Blissful Vision (Poetry), by J. Albert Libby; The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment, by the Rev. Henry Constable: The Saint's Joy and Sorrow, from *The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*; The Use and Value of the Term "Aion," by Thomas De Quincy; The Return of the Lord Jesus Christ, from *The Rainbow*; "Ascension Robes," by the Editor; Editorial.

NUMBER 4. Immaterialism; or, Soul-Immortality Refuted, by Eld. Wm. Sheldon; The Throne of David, by Eld. Frank Burr; A Review of Prof. Bartlett's "Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation," by the Rev. Henr. Constable: The Errors of the Age, from *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*; Hades and Heaven, by Eld. James H. Whitmore; Can the Earth Contain Its Inhabitants, if They Are Resurrected, by the Editor; Editorial.

UMI

Again he says: "In defining terms they [Adventists] sometimes say that spirit means *breath* when referring to man, and soul means animal life, or vital principle. This is sometimes true, and sometimes it is false, as in the passage, 'I pray God your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,' which becomes a prayer in behalf of the breath of the Thessalonians, consisting of oxygen and nitrogen inhaled and exhaled, their vital principle, and their bones and muscles, as if mere matter could be responsible."

Now Dr. Whedon has here placed himself in a dilemma, and must either plead ignorance or willful misrepresentation. He may seat himself on whichever of the two horns pleases him best. He has intimated that Adventists teach that spirit *always* means breath, and soul *always* means the vital principle; and the form of his charge, which, avoiding a direct statement, is still a clear intimation, indicates that the second horn of the dilemma in which he finds himself is his only choice: for no Adventist ever, any where (that we ever heard of), asserted what the Doctor intimates. They do assert, and prove, that the words soul and spirit have various meanings; and that, as in the case of any other word with primary and secondary significations, the context and sense of the passage determine their meaning in any given case. If the Doctor had said that Adventists "say—that *sometimes* spirit means breath," etc., he would have stated the exact truth, which he himself also must believe.

In the very next paragraph to the one quoted above, the Doctor says of the word "soul"—"under which term WE *include* what in Scripture psychology *is implied in both soul and spirit*." Now if he may take the liberty to include *soul* and *spirit* in one entity, can he reasonably complain if on the same principle we include *all three* in one entity, and understand Paul's prayer to be that the Thessalonians might in *their entire nature* be kept holy, or "preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord?" If the Doctor can prove that their nature included an immaterial immortal soul; intangible, indivisible, and without form, that of course will be included in the petition: but this text does not prove the existence of such an entity in the make-up of man. (Further remarks are crowded out.)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

NUMBER 1. An Apology, by Eld. Joshua V. Himes; Truth and Love—Letter to a Clergyman, by the Rev. Samuel Minton; Christianity vs. Churchianity, by Eld. A. A. Phelps; Paul's "Desire to Depart," by Thos. Davidson; The Kingdom of God, by Eld. L. C. Collins; An Approaching Change, from *The North British Review*; Life and Death, by Eld. James H. Whitmore; The Signs, by the Rev. Horatius Bonar; Editorial.

NUMBER 2. The Comforting Hope, by Eld. O. R. Fassett; First Things and First Thoughts on Awaking, Anon; Evening by Evening (Poetry), Bonar; The Trinity, by Eld. E. Royce; Has He Come? by Eld. Geo. Thomson; Missionary Theology, by the Rev. Edward White; The Second Advent, Selected; Editorial.

NUMBER 3. The Gospel Preached to Abraham, by the Editor; The Blissful Vision (Poetry), by J. Albert Libby; The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment, by the Rev. Henry Constable: The Saint's Joy and Sorrow, from *The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*; The Use and Value of the Term "Aion," by Thomas De Quincy; The Return of the Lord Jesus Christ, from *The Rainbow*; "Ascension Robes," by the Editor; Editorial.

NUMBER 4. Immaterialism; or, Soul-Immortality Refuted, by Eld. Wm. Sheldon; The Throne of David, by Eld. Frank Burr; A Review of Prof. Bartlett's "Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation," by the Rev. Henr. Constable: The Errors of the Age, from *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*; Hades and Heaven, by Eld. James H. Whitmore; Can the Earth Contain Its Inhabitants, if They Are Resurrected, by the Editor; Editorial.

UMI

VOL 2

MICROFILMED—1976

MILLERITES AND EARLY ADVENTISTS SECTION 5 REEL 1 OF 13

MILLERITES AND EARLY ADVENTISTS

Section 5: Extant periodicals from 1831-circa 1869. (Millerite, anti-Millerite and Adventist publications.)

ADVENT Christian quarterly. v1-2; July 1869-April 1871. Buchanan, Mich., Western Advent Christian Publishing Association.

Advent Christian Quarterly

Volumes 1-2

July 1869-April 1871

Reel 1 of 13

TERMS OF THE QUARTERLY.

THE QUARTERLY is issued in July, October, January and April. Each number contains 80 pp. Subscriptions may commence with any number.

Single copy, one year,	$1.00
Five copies " " to one address	4.00
Ten " " " " "	6.00
Single copies	.30

To ministers, 50c., a volume of four numbers.

Any person sending a new subscriber for the *Advent Times*, for one year, shall be entitled to THE QUARTERLY for 75c.

Any person sending four subscribers to THE QUARTERLY for one year, shall receive a copy for one year, free.

Any person sending five subscribers to the *Times* for one year, shall receive THE QUARTERLY, FREE.

Communications may be addressed to either of the editors, as follows: James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y; or, Wm. L. Himes, Buchanan, Mich.

All business letters should be addressed to

JOSHUA V. HIMES, Buchanan, Mich.

N. B.—A few copies of Volume I. bound, for sale, at $2 a volume. Unbound, $1.25.

Volume II. bound, $1.50. Unbound, $1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. I.

No. 1. JULY, 1869.

An Apology. By Eld. Joshua V. Himes.
Letter from A. A. Phelps; Early corruption of Christian Doctrine; Experience in the "Christian" church; Introduction of Destructionist views among Adventists; Importance of the question overlooked. Re-examination of the subject; Human sympathy—extract from Edwards; The Fathers—the spell broken. pp. 3–11.

Truth and Love. By Samuel Minton, M. A.
Destructionist views no ground for the withdrawal of Christian fellowship. pp. 11–14.

Christianity vs. Churchianity. By Eld. A. A. Phelps.
An age of counterfeits; The true and the nominal church; Christ and the Church not identical; Christian worship and church worship not identical; Worship by proxy; Christian fellowship and church fellowship not identical; Churchianity defined. pp. 14–19.

Paul's "Desire to Depart." By Thomas Davidson.
Assertions and charges are not arguments; the question stated; ANALUSAI defined; Paul's "strait;" the "burning desire;" Is Paul self-consistent? ANALUO—its usage; Christ's language; A reviewer in an awkward position; Paul to the Thessalonians; Peter's language; Did Paul use deceptive or careless language? Who are Sadducees? The time of reward; "This earthly house;" "Absent from the body;" The better way. pp. 19–31.

The Kingdom of God. By L. C. Collins.
The question stated; The only safe principle of interpretation; Facts justify literal interpretation; The kingdom of God literal and with locality; Shadow and substance; The three worlds; The great image; The "stone" kingdom—to stand forever; The stone does not symbolize the gospel; Daniel ch. 7; The kingdom "at hand;" Objections considered—Mat. 16:28; Mk. 9:1; Lk. 17:21; Jno. 18:36; Rom. 14:17; Col. 1:13; The parables illustrative of the kingdom—Mat. 13:33; 13:31, 32; Hope centers in the second advent. pp. 31–49

An Approaching Change. North British Review. p. 49.

Life and Death. By James H. Whitmore.
The terms defined and illustrated: Panton Ham on the use of the terms; Abp. Whately; Matteson's mistake; Conclusive testimony; Pres. Dwight's admission; Orthodoxy against the Bible; The Life-giver; A magnificent destiny; Destruction of death; Reason of the unpopularity of the doctrine of the Advent. pp. 50–63.

The Signs. (Sel.) By H. Bonar.
Night cometh—the day at hand; The signs notable and numerous; The diffu-

tion of infidelity; Increase of immorality; Prevalence of formalism; Strange mixture of opinions; Wars, rumors of wars, earthquakes, etc.; General restlessness; Missions; Prevalent disbelief; The spread of knowledge; General review of the situation. pp. 64–76.
Editorial.
THE QUARTERLY—Its purpose and objects; Our contributors; Dr. Charles K. True on Punishment.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1869.
The Comforting Hope. By O. R. Fassett, M. D.
The resurrection of Christ the foundation of all hope of a future existence; The dead who are "brought again"—Landis on Bush; Are the souls asleep? Primitive and modern phraseology—the difference between them; Phil. 1: 22, 23; 2 Cor. 5: 2–4; Tradition added to Scripture; Gibbon, Hudson, Tyndall; The hopeless sorrow of the heathen—illustrated by extracts and epitaphs; "Sorrow NOT without hope;" The "Styx" and Jordan; Testimony of the Catacombs of Rome, with quotations; Modern epitaphs; Whately on the intermediate state. pp. 82–106.
First things and first thoughts on Awaking. Anon. pp. 106–114.
Evening by Evening. Poetry. H. Bonar. p. 115
The Trinity. An historical sketch by E. Royce. pp. 116–124.
Has He Come? By Eld. Geo. Thomson.
The coming personal; In the clouds; With angels; Resurrection; Judgment; Time of reward; Enthroned. pp. 125–132.
Missionary Theology. By Rev. Edward White.
The dearth of interest in missions; Skepticism as to the theory on which they are established; Influence of the dogma of endless misery; Its evils clearly stated; Life in Christ and the personal Advent the true missionary doctrines. pp. 132–141.
The Second Advent.
Importance of the topic; Its nature; EPIPHANIA—PAROUSIA; Time of the Advent; Preceding signs; Practical moral bearing of the doctrine. pp. 141–150.
Editorial.
"The Doctrine of Immortality;" How THE QUARTERLY is received; The central truth; The Duke of Argyll on the generation of thought. pp. 159–160.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1870.
The Gospel Preached to Abraham. By Wm. L. Himes.
Judaism defined; Its fundamental error; The Judaizers of Galatia; The Gospel—what it includes; Preached to Abram; The original promises—what they included; Abram's "whereby;" No new reasoning; The fulfillment of the typical promise; The accurate performance of God's words; The promises of eternal things; A popular error; The inheritance—its extent; the consummation. pp. 161–182.
The Blissful Vision. A poem, by J. Albert Libby. p. 183.
The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.
Future punishment certain; Its duration positively endless; Its nature, death or extinction of being; The origin and growth of the torment dogma; Perversions of words; The language of both Testaments; The sense of Greek and Hebrew terms; Paul's willingness to be accursed; The vengeance of eternal fire; Origenism a consequence of Augustinianism—the one common ground of both systems considered; The final extinction of evil. pp. 184–216.
The Saints Joy and Sorrow. (Sel.) pp. 216–218.
The Use and Value of the term "Aion." Abridged from DeQuincy, by Jas. H. Whitmore. pp. 219–222.
The Return of Christ and the Hope of the Early Church. The Rainbow.
The Advent—its paramount importance in the minds of the Apostolic church. pp. 223–229.
Ascension Robes. By Wm. L. Himes.
Rise of the scandal; The true "Ascension Robe;" The "Wedding Garment;" Respectable endorsements of the falsehood; Unjustifiable course of the NEW Encyclopedia; Its inconsistencies; Orvis and Docsticks; Proof demanded in vain; Not ashamed of our hope. pp. 230–237.
Editorial.
Bible materialism gaining ground; Wm. Miller; Our future rest. pp. 239–240.

No. 4. APRIL, 1870.
Immaterialism. By William Sheldon.
The Bible statement of immortality; The soul; Evil results of Immortal-soulism; Catholicism; Mohammedanism; Mormonism; Necromancy; Transmigration; Hero-worship; Indian theology; Spiritism; Universalism; Endless torments; Denial of the resurrection; Denial of the personal Advent; Rewards before judgment; A sky-kingdom; The testimony summed up. pp. 241–264.
The Throne of David. By Eld. Frank Burr.
The covenant with David; Historical record; David's throne restored; All Israel saved. pp. 265–271.
A Review of Prof. Bartlett's "Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation." By Rev. Henry Constable.
Tribute to the Professor's ability; The "indispensable" word; Is its use sophistry? Fighting a man of straw; Whoever taught absolute annihilation? A charge refuted; A serious misrepresentation; The real point of difference; A revival of Manichæism; The claims of reason; Primary and secondary meanings; A false law of lingual interpretation; A challenge; Attempt to create prejudice, for a subsequent purpose; The appeal to lexicographers; The argument on judicial grounds—tropes not allowed in the construction of laws; Prof. Bartlett "hoisted with his own petard;" A clear definition fatal to error; Bartlett against the Scriptures; A foul slander against God; Horrible results of the premises laid down. pp. 272–290.

Errors of the Age. (Sel.) Bonar. pp. 291–304.
Hades and Heaven. By James H. Whitmore.
The mutual opposition of immaterialists—Clarke, Scott, Barnes, Bartlett, Matteson, Benson, Edwards, Fitch, J. Wesley; The conservative and radical theories; Each theory eats the other up; What say the Scriptures? The poets not good theologians; Barnes against Paul; Fitch's Spiritism; The dead unconscious. pp. 305–316.
Would Earth Contain its Resurrected Inhabitants? pp. 316–318.
Editorial.
Whedon on "Christian Sadducees;" A defence. pp. 318–320.

TABLE OF CONTENTS. VOL. II.

No. 1. JULY, 1870.
Loss and Gain. By A. A. Phelps, A. M.
What loss did Adam sustain in Eden? When will that loss be regained? Paradise; The favor of God lost; Purity lost; A happy home gone; Dominion lost; Life lost; Adam, himself, without hope; His posterity have hope; All that was lost in the disobedience of Adam to be restored through Christ; The whole earth to become Paradise. pp. 1–18.
The Restitution. By Eld. O. R. Fassett.
Paradise lost; Postdiluvian Migrations; Ruins of ancient lands and cities; The Northwestern settlements; A new continent; Dissatisfaction and unrest; Increased emigration; Earth's destruction; The time of restoration; The change near. pp. 19–32.
Object of the Present Dispensation. By Dr. McNeile. p. 32.
The Kingdom of God. By Wm. L. Himes.
The prophetic outline of history; The four successive kingdoms; Perversion of symbolism; The "stone" to destroy, not assimilate; Explanation of the phrase, flesh and blood; The kingdom not of this world; Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; The kingdom under the whole heaven; The Whitbyan theory overturned; The relatives of Christ before Domitian; A part often taken for the whole. Supposed objections considered, Rom. 14: 7, 1 Cor. 6: 9, 1 Cor. 4: 20, Col. 1: 13, "At hand," The transfiguration, Peter's interpretation, The kingdom within you, The kingdom now nigh at hand. pp. 33–49.
A Question for the Times. (Sel.)
Leaven—does it ever symbolize good? A negative answer, Objections considered, The work of the leaven about complete. pp. 49–56.
The Stumbling Block. By Rev. Samuel Minton.
The dogma of eternal evil the greatest of stumbling stones, Illustrations, The love of God, The removal of the offence, What Christ has done for the race, The dogma unreasonable and impossible to be true. pp. 57–68.
The Witch of Endor. (Sel.) By Prof. Walter Scott.
Saul deceived, Samuel not present at the interview, the truth demonstrated. pp. 67–75.
Editorial.
The name "Christian," Its origin, Proper and improper use.

No. 2. OCTOBER, 1870.
The Time of Reward. By Wm. L. Himes.
The popular belief, Its modifications, Character and object of the judgment, the only consistent theory, Is heaven to be our home, the type of the high priest, Saints and angels, Paul's materialism, Agreement of Christ, prophets and apostles, the Revelator's testimony, the resurrect on the time of reward. pp. 81–92.
The Final Punishment. By Rev. Willis Truthlover.
Reasons for writing, Principles of interpretation, Malachi's testimony, Burning up the chaff, Everlasting fire, the worm and fire, "Consume," Soul and body destroyed, Everlasting destruction, Everlasting punishment, Smoke of torment, Whence came the common doctrine? Man a living, not an immortal soul. pp. 92–105.
The Davidic Covenant. By Wm. L. Himes.
The sure mercies of David, the Davidic promises, David's throne overturned, the branch, Messiah's kingdom, the Jews'

error not literalism, the parable of the nobleman, Rev. 1 : 9, the PALINGENESIA and APOCATASTASIS, the glorious reality. pp. 105–116.

Stuart on Future Punishment. By Henry Constable.

Not a work for the times, the republishers unwise, Its force is against Origen s theory, It assumes the point now in dispute, Man made in the image of God, Stuart's admissions, the appeal from Stuart to Stuart, the light of nature, A challenge. pp. 117–125.

The popular Superstition. By Eld. O. R. Fassett.

What is a ghost? the children's discussion, Christian superstition, the Church Hellenized, Scripture necrology, the witch at Endor, Eliphaz' vision, Angels not human spirits, Ghost-stories, Appeal to the Scriptures. pp. 126–147.

Life and Immortality only in Christ. Rainbow. pp. 148–150.

The Principle of Interpretation. By Henry Constable. pp. 150–151.

The Doom of the Unjust. By Henry Constable.

A review of Mr. Pridham, exposing several popular errors upon the subject indicated. pp. 151–162.

Editorial. pp. 163–164.

No. 3. JANUARY, 1871.

Ancient Jewish Knowledge of the Future State. By Edward Falconer Litton.

Their sources of information, the immortality dogma unknown to the Jews, the Law, Division of opinion, Influence of Grecian philosophy, Life and immortality brought to light. pp. 1–9.

Satan's Estimate of Sin. (Sel.) pp. 9–15.

Is the Soul a Separate Entity? By Jas. H. Whitmore.

The subject opened, Mr. Clark's position, the once-in-seven-years-change theory exploded, Intuitions of duality, an assumed absurdity, testimony of consciousness, relations of mind to the body, appeal to the Creator, the phenomena of death, various objections considered—their weakness exposed, Facts vs. Assertion, Qualities of matter not yet fully understood. pp. 15–42.

The Burial of Moses. Poetry. pp. 42–43.

The Scripture Doctrine of a Future Life. By Rev. Wm. Leask.

Our right to question interpretations, God's honor involved, Scripture reveals a future life, it is not by nature, is connected with the resurrection, true progression, the glorious prospect. pp. 44–56.

The Doctrine of Eternal Punishment in its Relations to Ethical Science. By James Wm. Barlow.

We are capable of judging in matters of morals, origin of the faculty, Scripture enjoins its use, the appeal in case of differences of opinion, a misunderstanding corrected, sin by a finite being can not be an infinite offence, the relations of the offering of Christ, Creature responsibility, the necessarian theory, is God vindictive? an illustration, are there few that are saved? Francis' ingenuity in torture, a difficulty removed, importance of correct views, the horrors of the popular dogma not fully appreciated, a strong and just conclusion. pp. 57–79.

Preaching to Spirits in Prison. Biblical Notes and Queries. pp. 79–80.

No. 4. APRIL, 1871.

The Man of Sin. Anon.

Differing interpretations stated, and the Futurist exegesis thoroughly refuted, the man of sin identified in the Papacy. pp. 81–110.

Sheol. By Wm. L. Himes.

Appeal to Scripture usage, Underworld—what does it mean? Is the interior of the globe inhabited? SHEOL defined, Is "theological necessity" a proper rule of interpretation? An examination of every passage in which the term occurs, the conclusion from the investigation, the definitions of scholars, conclusion. pp. 112–133.

Immanuel's Land. Poetry. pp. 133–134.

The Pre-Existence of Christ. By James H. Whitmore.

The question stated, John's testimony, Christ's direct assertions, Insufficiency of Socinian exegesis, Pauline Christology, testimony of the Old Testament. pp. 134–145.

The Two-Horned Beast. By Eld. John Couch.

Varieties of opinion, Reason for these differences, Search of inspired interpretation, The same symbol in the Old Testament, The leopard beast, The Greek Empire, Intermarriage of the Russian emperors with the Cæsars. The "image beast," The Holy Alliance, Conclusion.

The Nature of the Soul. By Andrew Armour.

Editorial.

Doubts concerning Religion, McCosh on Materialism, The Little Stone, Table of Contents.

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

EDITED BY

WILLIAM L. HIMES.

If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain:....they also which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished.....But now is Christ risen from the dead. (1 Cor. 15: 17-20.)
Your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. (Col. 3: 3, 4.)
Looking for that blessed hope. (Tit 2: 13.)

BUCHANAN, MICHIGAN:
WESTERN ADVENT-CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.
1869.

UMI

"Voice of the West" Press: W. A. C. P. Association,
Buchanan, Mich.

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—JULY, 1869.—NO. I.

AN APOLOGY.

During the summer of 1868, I received the following letter:

Dear Brother in Christ: We are strangers to each other. I am a Free Methodist preacher, stationed in Rochester, N. Y. I am in sympathy with earnest Christianity, and am striving to promote it. My attention has been turned, of late, toward some of the special planks in your theological platform. I am an honest inquirer after truth. But I cannot *leap* to conclusions. I want a rocky foundation on which to stand. I am committed to follow Jesus whithersoever he may lead me. I have been wonderfully saved from sectarian bigotry. I think more of God than of all the Churches combined. I am after truth—goodness—purity—salvation—eternal life! It occurred to me that you might help me by your own experience. I understand that you are one of the oldest Advent preachers. Also, that you only quite recently embraced the theory that the wicked will be exterminated. I will be very much obliged if you will answer a few queries:

1. Are you now fully settled that the wicked will be stricken out of existence?

2. If this is the true Scripture doctrine, why did you not embrace it sooner Perhaps you see the point of difficulty in my mind. If it took you years to reach a settled belief, does it not seem that there are at least *two sides* to the subject, with strong arguments and strong objections on either hand?

3. Can you harmonize your present views with the entire Bible? Do you not find real difficulties that you have to pass over without a solution?

4. It is evident that in *your* mind, at least, there were, for many years, formidable barriers in the way of adopting some of the views now common among the Advent people. How did you get through those difficulties? is the question that especially interests me. A full, explicit answer would be hailed with special gratitude. This letter is not designed for controversy or

speculation, but to bring out the light, and, if possible, help an anxious heart. *Does it look all clear and harmonious to you now?* Are you *sure* you are on the Bible platform? Please go over the ground, and meet my solicitudes as best you can.

A. A. PHELPS.

Rochester, N. Y., July 20, 1868.

To these queries I gave a private reply; but similar interrogations from strangers, and old fellow-laborers in the Advent cause, concerning my change of views upon this awful subject, seem to demand a more particular and public answer. This answer I have long intended to make, in a work that should give an extended view of the considerations which led me to make a re-examination of this question, and the arguments which revolutionized my opinions concerning it.

This work, of which this article was designed to form the opening chapter, has been written at intervals, during tours in different sections of the country, amid the perplexity of onerous cares and duties in other directions, but is now nearly completed, and may, I hope, be published soon.

I. To Eld. Phelps' first question, I reply: I am "fully settled" that the final doom of the ungodly is extinction of being.

And I may here remark, that the author of the above questions, formerly an elder in the Free Methodist connection, a Christian minister of rare spirit and worth, has himself now become "fully settled" on this question, and is thoroughly convinced that man is a mortal being, and that the doom of wicked men is, literally, "everlasting destruction."[1]

II. That the Christian Church and doctrine were early corrupted by the influence of converts made from the schoolmen, both Greeks and Latins, of the Platonic and other philosophies, is not a disputed point. But I also am sure, though as yet comparatively few admit it, that among these corruptions are to be numbered the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, a conscious intermediate state, and the everlasting suffering of the finally impenitent. The influence of the Platonic philosophy, and its spiritualizing system of Biblical interpretation, has been such that for centuries the above doctrines, though nowhere stated in plain terms in the Bible, and with only a few passages of Scripture apparently reading in their favor, while hundreds of passages in the plain letter of their language are decidedly against them, have been made a test of Orthodoxy.

[1] See his article, *Settled at Last*, in *Voice of the West* for April 13, 1869.

Now while I make no pretensions to the learning of the schools, I do confess that in the past I have had too much confidence in many of their teachings, which I followed for nearly forty years.

I made a profession of religion, and joined the Christian Church in New Bedford, Mass., in 1824. This body was at that time divided in sentiment in their views of the nature of man. Some held with Eld. Elias Smith, one of the founders of that denomination, who taught that man was a mortal being, and that the doom of the sinner was, to be destroyed forever.[1] Others, with Eld. Abner Jones, another prominent leader of that sect, held to the common view of the immortality of the soul and the eternal misery of the lost.

I was by some train of circumstances and associations, which I cannot now recall, much prejudiced against Eld. Smith's views, and embraced those of his opponents. So that my first impressions on this important subject favored the common theology.

In 1830 I was settled over the First Christian Church of Boston. As there was considerable affinity between the Christians and Unitarians of Boston and Cambridge, chiefly on account of the anti-Trinitarian views of the former, I was brought into fraternal relations with the last named body. I had the regard of all, but received special attentions from Drs. Channing and Gannett, and Prof. Henry Ware, jr., and others at Harvard University. As I was not an educated man, they afforded me many facilities for the prosecution of certain studies, which I could pursue in connection with my pastoral duties. By these associations I became more fully educated in the theory, and confirmed in the belief of the doctrines of the immortality of the soul.

In 1839 I sought and made the acquaintance of William Miller, and heard from him the argument for the personal return of Christ, and his reign on the earth in a renewed condition. He also taught the immortality of the soul, and the usual attendant doctrines of that dogma; so that while his arguments induced me to change my views of the nature of the Millennium and the divinity of Christ, I was still further confirmed in my erroneous opinions of the nature of man and the destiny of the lost.

In 1840 the subject of the mortality of man and the destruction of the wicked was introduced among the Adventists by the writ-

[1] In *The Herald of Gospel Liberty*, Vol. 3, No. 75, speaking of "thousands in the Western country," he said: "They also discard the *popular* and *pagan* doctrine of eternal misery; believing that the *end* of the wicked is *destruction*, according to the words of Solomon, 'As the whirlwind passeth, so is the wicked no more.'"

ings of Henry Grew, one of the ablest of the many writers who have treated upon that question. The same views were put into a popular form by Eld. Geo. Storrs, in six sermons, which he published and scattered widely, with no little success in making converts to the views he then held. But they made no impression upon my mind. I had read long before the works of Elias Smith and Henry Grew, and being strongly entrenched in the popular theology, was not prepared to look with interest or favor on later productions; more especially as I felt the responsibility of a work which occupied my entire strength and attention, viz: to publish the news of the speedy coming of Christ and his kingdom.

Occupied as I was with the imminence of the Second Advent, these other views seemed to me to be a side issue, and of no special importance. Jesus was at hand, and it was in my estimation of more importance to prepare a people for his coming, than to enlighten them on these other questions. Whether men slept or were conscious in death, and were destroyed or suffered eternally for sin, were questions of minor importance to me. God would do right; and we should soon know all about it. My business was to proclaim the glorious coming and kingdom of Christ and prepare myself and others to meet the Judge.

How far these opinions and feelings were justifiable, in view of my early education, sympathies (or prejudices, if the reader pleases), and the pressing responsibilities of the time, I will not here discuss. Others shared them with me, and I held them without misgivings or doubt up to about the year 1860, when I was led to make a

RE-EXAMINATION OF THE SUBJECT.

I have said that up to 1860 I was not impressed with the importance of the so-called *Life and Death question* as a vital issue in Christian theology. It was, I think, in that year that I was led to commence an earnest re-examination of the subject, as the result of a deeply interesting conversation and discussion with Dr. O. R. Fassett, who was then residing in Westboro, Mass.

Our conversation turned on the eternal suffering of the wicked, and the consistency of its relations to the revealed attributes of God, particularly his love and his justice. Eld. Fassett argued that the Almighty could not consistently doom a frail, weak, though sinning, creature to eternal, indescribable anguish, without one ray of light or hope as to the future. He appealed to my

sympathies, declaring his belief that I could not, at heart, as a man or a Christian, seriously believe a dogma so horrifying. Previous to this, I had always taken the ground that human sympathy had nothing to do with the truth on this question, but his appeal now produced an impression I could not rid myself of. I felt that I was touched as never before, and that the subject demanded my most serious attention.

In pursuing the subject I found no relief from the arguments or considerations advanced by the advocates of eternal wo respecting the sympathies of the righteous. Take for example the sentiments uttered by Jonathan Edwards:

> "The woes of sinners in hell will not be a cause of grief to the saints in heaven—but of rejoicing. This rejoicing will be the fruit of an amiable disposition, and a perfect holiness, and conformity to Christ. At the judgment you may be ready to fly to some godly friend, but you will see them unconcerned for you, with joy ascending to meet the Lord, and not less joyful for the horror in which they see you. When THEY HEAR you GROAN and SIGH and GNASH YOUR TEETH, these things will not MOVE them at all to pity you. *After your godly parents shall have seen you lie in hell millions of years, or ages, in torment day and night, they will not begin to pity you then. They will praise God that his justice appears in the eternity of your misery.* The torments in hell will be immeasurably greater than being in a GLOWING OVEN, A BRICK KILN, OR FIERY FURNACE."

My soul sickened at such sentiments. It seemed to me that none but a monomaniac upon the subject could so write or believe: and I soon dismissed once and forever the Orthodox views on the question of sympathy with the lost.

I know that Landis, while ingeniously avoiding the real force of this question, attempts to cover his evasion of it by coarse denunciations of those who have examined the dogma of deathless agony, for the lost in the light of human sympathy, styling their reasoning "mawkish," "namby-pamby sentimentalism;" but we doubt if either he or any of his fellows in the Orthodox ministry of to-day dare give utterance in their pulpits to the sentiments quoted above from Edwards. The demands of human sympathy have undeniably greatly modified Orthodox doctrine. It is not now what it was even a few years since. Still in writing and preaching, this question of sympathy is evaded, or passed over in silence. But we cannot evade the fact, that if the lost are to lie in *gehenna* suffering eternally concentrating agony as long as God and his saints live, those saints, in order to hap-

UMI

piness, must become so utterly callous to all claims for pity as to be absolutely unmoved by the deathless pangs of their former companions, children, friends, and fellow-beings, though fully conscious of what they are enduring, and also aware that the passage of ages of sufferings so far from bringing them nearer a termination, must in the very nature of the case add intensity to their woe.

Scholastic theology, dealing with dogmas and "immortal souls" as mere abstractions, may calmly reason of eternal woe; but when we examine the subject in the light of the fact that we, our families, friends, and fellow men, as beings of sensitive natures, keenly alive to mental and physical suffering, are exposed to such a peril as the dogma of eternal misery asserts, one may indeed attempt to receive, or imagine it as true; but as Bp. Newton has well said, "seriously believe it you cannot!" It would be a perversion of human nature to do so, to say nothing of the spirit of Christianity.

Our Heavenly Father has taught us by both precept and example to be "kind to the unthankful and the unholy" in this life, and our hearts are easily roused by the sufferings of our common humanity. But, we are told, in the world to come we shall behold countless myriads of the lost in the torments of hell, as "in an unfathomable sea of liquid fire, where the wicked must drink in everlasting torture,"[1] and not feel one sympathetic emotion, or our happiness be for a moment marred by the terrible scene!

I know that our sympathies, of themselves, cannot, and should not, settle this question: yet they furnish a presumptive argument against the doctrine of deathless woe much stronger than many of the arguments from reason, so-called, which Immaterialists offer for the immortality of the soul: for instance, those drawn from the powers of the mind, its desires, etc.

But it is said, that our sympathy has nothing to do with the justice of God. Allowing the claim to be a just one, for the sake of the argument, the question would still arise, "What is *justice* in the case of the lost?" In my meditations, my mind would recall the horrid descriptions I had heard and read of the future of the lost. I seemed to be placed among them, and beheld in imagination untold millions writhing in unutterable anguish, eternity before them, with no hope of release, but filled with a

[1] Benson.

horrible despair at the prospect of ever-increasing, as well as ever-during suffering—shipwrecked, and drifting upon a shoreless sea of woe!

Such reflections continually forced themselves upon me. I could not divest myself of them, as I had put aside the consideration of the subject in other days, by the thought that the question was a side-issue, and that "God would do right" in any case; but I felt that I must satisfy myself that there was *no mistake* in that interpretation of Scripture whose issue was now so revolting to my whole nature. And thus I was led to, I believe, a candid and thorough re-examination of the entire subject, as presented in the word of God, which I recognized as my only rule of faith in regard to this, or any other doctrine. I would bow to the sacred word; but I must re-examine its utterances on the doom awaiting, perhaps, the larger portion of mankind.

Immediately other influences began to affect me. As a public teacher I had long stood opposed to the doctrine of the sleep of the dead and destruction of the wicked, and I must now meet a large circle of companions and friends, endeared by many ties in the past, who had received the views I now questioned from both my lips and pen; who looked to me for a sturdy defense of a doctrine the truth of which I was fairly beginning to doubt. They had learned of me, taken my counsel in upholding the Orthodox views and opposing the "annihilationists," as they were, and are, popularly called. I must be prepared to have my motives impugned, and my words, spoken and written before my mind was assailed by doubts, or convicted of my error, "cast in my teeth," while many who had been my friends would walk with me no more. I had to count the cost. I must pass through a severe conflict in the midst of onerous labors in another department of a great cause. But my mind was made up. I was determined to know for myself if there was not a more consistent and harmonious interpretation of the word of God, and to stand by the convictions of truth which should result from my investigations at whatever cost.

III. As to the inquiry concerning present difficulties, I find no perplexity in my own mind in harmonizing the Scripture testimony concerning the penalty of sin. To say that I am fully satisfied of the exact meaning of every passage of Scripture involved in the question at issue would perhaps seem like arrogating too much to myself: but I have learned, at least, not to give to any one pas-

UMI

sage standing by itself a gloss that shall contradict the general tenor of Scripture. And every fresh examination of any branch of this great question of *life and death eternal* strengthens my convictions that eternal life is "the gift of God," while "the wages of sin is death."

IV. In answer to the fourth query advanced by my interlocutor, I would say, there *were* "formidable barriers" in the way of my reception of this doctrine. Chief among these, and beside the considerations already named, was *the authority of the Christian fathers.*

I took it for granted, first of all, that the early fathers of the Church were to be relied upon in their expositions of apostolic teaching. Associated with the apostles or their immediate disciples, I reasoned that they must have understood the construction which the personal disciples of Jesus Christ gave to his words concerning the awful doom of the finally impenitent. It was long a question how many of the fathers of the second century and onward could advance such sentiments as they did concerning the immortality of the soul and future punishment, unless they had received them from the apostles, or apostolic converts. But the spell (and it is a spell that still holds many in bondage to a dreadful theology) was at last broken by the Savior's own teaching: "Call *no man* father upon earth," he said to his Church. And this destroys all claims to authority in matters of faith and doctrine of the writings of uninspired men, even though they lived near or in the apostles' days.

Besides this, on examination I soon saw the defectiveness of their teachings on other questions, and the additions made by them to the testimony of the Scriptures on various points of doctrine. Take for instance the intermediate state, and the use of the word *hades*—the grave, or rather the general state of the dead. Most of the fathers adopted the heathen view of *hades*, in brief, as follows: *Hades* was located in the deep—under, or in the bowels of, the earth. It was divided into two apartments, *Elysium*—the Fathers' Paradise—and *Tartarus*. Here were gathered the shades, or ghosts, or souls of the dead, awaiting the resurrection: the righteous "comforted," while the wicked were "tormented" in the flames of tartarus.[1]

But neither Christ nor his apostles ever taught such doctrine.

[1] It is to be observed that if the fathers are authority for our faith in the matter of a conscious intermediate state, they are equally so on the torments of souls by *literal* fire in *hades*—which is now almost universally denied by leading Orthodox teachers.

It is simply a heathen fable engrafted upon the pure teachings of the New Testament. True, a few passages are perverted to sustain this fabulous theory; and the perverted sense of these passages is made a standard by which the entire word is interpreted, and made to mean in some hundreds of instances precisely the opposite of what it says.

I know these are, as they stand here, mere assertions; but they are assertions, I am confident, which cannot be successfully controverted. The teachings of the fathers concerning the intermediate state, or any other point, have no claim upon our faith except as they harmonize with the oracles of God: and of their meaning we are, in most respects, in this day, probably even better qualified to judge than the fathers were.

Here I pause, having carried out, so far as my limits would admit, the design of this article. I did not intend to consider in it the arguments and reasons for my present faith, but, rather, to give my *experience* in reaching the conclusions in which my mind is now settled. The arguments which have forced me as an honest man and a Christian to take a decided stand, and exert a vigorous opposition against the views I once held, will be forthcoming, either in these pages, or elsewhere.

TRUTH AND LOVE—LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN.

I should not have troubled you with another letter, but for the avowal with which you conclude, that you feel bound to withdraw from Christian intercourse with any who "cause to err;" *i. e.*, who differ from you in any religious opinion, and venture to express their opinion; including of course all Baptists, Arminians, anti-Millennarians, and others, whom you must necessarily consider amongst those who "cause to err." This spirit, or principle, if you prefer it, has been the bane of the Church in all ages; it was the life and soul of the Inquisition, it is the essential virus of the worst kind of schism, and is that which enables the world to say, "See how these Christians hate one another!"

In this question of eternal suffering you have not even the excuse of its being a matter of *faith;* it is simply a matter of *opinion*. I do not say merely of *interpretation*, because a matter of faith, such as the deity of Christ or the Atonement, may de-

pend on interpretation. But this doctrine, however important it may be in its practical bearings, and therefore however worthy of earnest discussion, is purely a matter of opinion.

I might have some excuse for elevating it into a matter of faith; because my enjoyment in looking forward to eternity depends in great measure on the assurance that God will be "*all in all*," that sin and misery will come to an end; and that at length "there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain."

I can rejoice even now, notwithstanding the existence of present evil, "in hope of the glory of God;" in the prospect not merely of being myself delivered from the power of evil, but of forming part of God's glorious universe, when evil has been banished from it forever.

I should be sorry to be *able* to rejoice in the prospect of an eternity throughout which the wailings of despair would be continually ringing in my ears, and the writhings of agony be ever before my eyes; and equally sorry to think that I could ever sink to such an unutterable depth of selfishness as to be able to spend an eternity of happiness in forgetfulness of the fact that such things were going on, even though they were put far away out of sight and out of sound.

Furthermore, my hope of immortality depends upon the plain, natural meaning of those innumerable texts which you are obliged to rationalize upon, and interpret in a non-natural sense, in order to maintain the traditional philosophy about man's inherent immortality.

But *you* have no pretext for it whatever. Neither your faith nor your hope can in the slightest degree depend upon your interpretation of those passages being correct. Your hope centres in the salvation which Christ offers from sin and all its consequences. What those consequences will ultimately be to such as are not saved is a matter of opinion, and cannot possibly, in *your* view of it, touch the foundation at all. The eternal life, which we have in him, is precisely the same thing, whatever be the alternative to those who refuse it. So, too, are the means by which he obtained it for us, and communicates it to us.

If indeed we believed your view to be taught in Scripture, and still denied its truth, the case would be different; for we should be shaking the foundation of *all* faith. But you know that it is not so. You may think that our judgment is biased by our feelings, as we may think that yours is biased by traditional opinion and party discipline. But when Christians of approved character and undoubted credibility on both sides solemnly declare their conviction that the view they hold is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture as a whole, then for either party to break fellowship with the other on such a matter as this, because they refuse to do violence to their own convictions, and to accept the dictum of those who take another view, is, in the last degree, unchristian in principle, and disastrous in its effects upon the Church and the world. "Whereto we have already attained let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing, and if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you."

That the difference of opinion is a very serious and important one, as bearing upon the success of the Gospel, from a human point of view, I not only admit, but strenuously maintain. I believe that your doctrine is the fruitful parent both of infidelity and of indifference; that it weakens the Gospel message, and in a variety of ways does incalculable mischief. You, on the other hand, think that my doctrine will make sinners less anxious to be converted, because less afraid of the ultimate consequences of sin; that the state of mind, which Paul pronounced to be the natural consequence of disbelieving in any future state either of happiness or misery, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," will also be produced, if men are told that the result of such conduct will merely be the loss of eternal happiness, and everlasting destruction soul and body in hell.

No doubt this difference of opinion, like *every* difference in a greater or less degree, must interpose *some* difficulty in our working together, and detract *somewhat* from the pleasure of mutual intercourse. But to refuse to hold communion with one another, to denounce one another, or to change countenance toward one another on that account would be a grievous sin—a sin of ignorance perhaps, but still a sin.

Do not those who are looking for the Lord's speedy coming believe that they who expect the world to be converted by missionary agency "cause to err," and weaken the force of the cry, "Prepare to meet thy God?" And on the other hand, do not those who believe that expectation to be Scriptural, consider that you and other Millenarians "cause to err?" Do they not believe that you will probably be the cause of many heathens spending an eternity in torment, by damping the missionary zeal of

UMI

those whose enthusiasm would have been kindled at the prospect of converting the world? Both sides are not only at liberty, but absolutely bound, according to the strength of their convictions, to endeavor to spread their own opinion. But are they to excommunicate one another, or look coldly upon one another, on account of this difference? Is it to embitter their mutual intercourse, or to debar them from all intercourse? Is one to call the other heretic, infidel, and so forth, because he "perverts" or "corrupts" what appears to his opponent's eyes so "plainly revealed," so "explicitly declared" in Scripture? Alas for our Master's seamless robe! Alas for the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace! How long, O Lord, how long?

CHRISTIANITY VS. CHURCHIANITY.

We are living in an age of shams and counterfeits. Satan seems to have abandoned the hope of crushing out the Christian Church by a process of undisguised hostility, and now seeks to destroy her efficiency by stealthily draining off her vitality, and robbing her of every supernatural element. He "transforms himself into an angel of light," and often assumes to be the special friend and guardian of the Church. Craftily he infuses his deadly virus and inculcates his plausible philosophy, until the moral perception is obscured, the conscience is distorted, and policy runs nearly the whole ecclesiastical machinery. Thus a popularized religion—which costs nothing and is worth nothing—is readily accepted, while the old religion of the cross is utterly discarded. The consequence is, that there is *religion* enough, and *Churchianity* enough, but *a great famine of real Christianity*. We meet with thousands all over the land who, if catechised in regard to their spiritual condition, reply with much self-assurance that they are members of such a Church. They assume that the Church is an ark of safety; and, once ensconced within her enclosures, all further anxiety ends. Let us try to unmask this dreadful delusion of the devil.

There is a difference, we may premise, between the *real* and the *nominal* Church of Christ. The former is composed of all true Christians. Its boundaries are therefore invisible, as no man can tell exactly where to draw the lines. The latter is composed of

those who assume the Christian name and practice the ordinances of God's house. It is commonly called the *visible* Church, because its boundary lines are known. The epithet may apply to a single local society of a given denomination, or to the aggregate of local societies of all denominations. We use the term, in this paper, to designate the outward or visible Church.

I. *Christ and the Church are not identical.* There may be ten thousand Churches, but there is only *one Christ*. Nor can *all* those Churches supply the place of our *one, blessed, all-sufficient Savior*. A man may be saved without the Church, but he cannot be saved without Christ. A man may be in the Church and *not* be saved; but he cannot be in *Christ* without salvation. *Sinners* sometimes become members of the Church; but only *saints* are members of Christ. A person may live in the Church for years, with the old heart of carnality and selfishness; but "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." Multitudes who are faithful to Church ordinances will land in perdition; but none who are faithful to Christ can possibly be lost. The requirements of the Church are often wrong and ruinous; but the claims of Christ are always reasonable and right. The Church may become a sink of pollution; but Christ is ever the perfection of purity. The Church may be rent with divisions; but Jesus Christ is not divided. The Church may become terribly entangled in mysticism and error; but Christ is always the embodiment of light and truth. The Church may change her name and her nature; but Christ is "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." The Church may be a good crutch to walk with, but she is a poor Christ to trust in for salvation and eternal life.

II. *Christian worship and Church worship are not identical.* Vast multitudes cling to some Church establishment as a drowning man would cling to a life-boat. They bow obsequiously to her priestly and official mandates, and imagine that the blind servility which they render to the Church will be accounted acceptable service offered to Christ. If we do not misinterpret the tendency of the times, *there never was greater danger of making this fatal mistake than now*. Ritualism is rife. The simplicity of the gospel is lost in the imposing forms and glittering accompaniments of modern churchism. Splendid church edifices attract the eye. Splendid music charms the ear. Splendid prayers are addressed to the congregation. Splendid sermons please the fancy, and leave deluded sinners to slumber on.

UMI

Church rivalry has achieved a glorious success, if success consists in gorgeous temples, tall steeples, loud-sounding bells, thundering organs, ostentatious dressing, theatrical singing, pointless praying, rhetorical preaching, careless hearing, and unscriptural practicing!

Much of the current worship is done by proxy. Lazy religionists surrender their sacred rights to others. They take it for granted that the preacher is on the right track, and readily swallow whatever may be doled out from the pulpit, without using their own brains in searching for the hidden treasures of truth. Thus religious ideas are transmitted from generation to generation, until tradition exerts a more powerful influence than the Bible in molding the sentiments of men. There comes to be a fashionable *faith*, as well as a fashionable dress. To embrace a certain stereotyped circle of doctrinal views entitles a man to the claim of "orthodoxy;" but let him not venture one step out of the beaten track, if he would not be denounced as a deluded heretic! But few have the moral courage to question the decisions of the Church, much less to discard what she has labeled as "orthodox." The verdict of a few leading denominations has thus grown up into a threatening *tyranny*; and the multitude cannot think of stemming the mighty tide. So they bow down in their narrow enslavement and worship this curiously-fashioned but pious-looking idol—*the Church!* Since all idolatry is an abomination to God, we have no more right to worship a *church* than we have to worship a *golden calf!* We rob the Lord of his rightful honor, and ourselves of the highest bliss of Christianity, by looking to the Church too much, and "looking unto Jesus" too little. What can be done to deal a staggering blow to this cruel church-worship of the day, and at the same time give us more exalted and ravishing views of Jesus Christ? There is a grand failure to carry out the ultimate design, when the appliances of the gospel result only in the production of *Churchianity*. Our perception, our prayers, our faith, and our adoration must overleap the narrow precincts of the outward Church, and rise up to the eternal throne! "*Worship God!*"

III. *Christian fellowship and Church fellowship are not identical.* The followers of Christ are called upon to "love one another with a pure heart fervently." Indeed, this is one of the Scriptural tests of discipleship. "We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren." All Christians constitute one family, and *love* is the golden tie designed to

bind their hearts together around the common cross. But love is a tender plant that needs to be reared with a gentle hand. Hence the many exhortations of Scripture to "consider one another"—to "be kindly affectioned one to another"—to esteem others better than ourselves—to "bear one another's burdens"—to exercise a forgiving spirit—to "let brotherly love continue"—to "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace." All such injunctions point out the danger of alienated feelings and poisoned affections, and show the importance of making a special effort to promote Christian unity and love. How disastrous are the results of not regarding these gospel precepts! Trivial differences of opinion are considered a sufficient ground for dividing the religious world into a thousand rival sects. Thus the general Church presents the strange spectacle of a thousand hostile armies, moving about with drawn swords and bristling bayonets, taking advantage of every weak point, and expending far more ammunition in firing into each other's ranks than they do in battering down the bulwarks of sin and Satan. This general jargon is by no means adapted to make a deep and favorable impression upon the hearts of sinners, but is especially calculated to convert the world to infidelity, and forestall the triumphs of the cross.

Most of the Churches have erected a false standard of piety, and made unauthorized tests of membership. *Churchianity* insists upon similarity of *opinions;* while *Christianity* makes a wide margin for doctrinal differences, and cries, as it goes on its heaven-born mission, "*If thy heart be as mine, give me thy hand!*" The Church belongs to Christ; and every true Christian has a right within her pale. An association that refuses admission to one who gives the clearest evidence of experimental and practical piety, is unworthy the name of a Christian Church. *Head*-religion may answer to make Church-members, but it takes *heart*-religion to make *Christians.* Some people are so thoroughly saturated with sectarianism, that they will never become decent specimens of Christianity till this wretched leaven is purged away. And the disease is so deeply seated that they will need to take many allopathic doses of gospel charity!

Oh! what formidable walls has bigotry reared, to keep asunder those who ought to be one in Christ! Churchianity shrivels the soul into contemptible narrowness; but Christianity enlarges the heart and fills it with genuine charity and generous impulses.

UMI

The former turns men into partisans and proselytes: the latter leads to deeds of noble daring for the honor of God and the elevation of man, without distinction of color, dialect, race, or sex. Our true position is to recognize goodness wherever we find it, and to denounce evil wherever it lifts its unholy head. "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good," and throw the rest away. No Church is *wholly wrong;* no Church is *unexceptionably right.* Let us be careful, therefore, that our eulogiums upon Churches are not too emphatic, nor our denunciations too bitter. Remember that even "our Church" may have something to condemn, while some other Church may have much to commend. How glorious is that moral heroism that dares break through the walls of sectarian bigotry, and join hands with *all* the friends of God, in pulling down the ramparts of the devil and building up that great temple of grace whose top-stone shall be laid amid the shoutings of immortal triumph!

Much that passes for Christian love is found, when thoroughly tested, to be nothing but Church love or party love. Let a Christian brother be compelled, by a course of candid investigation, to change his views or his Church relations, and how certainly the cold shoulder so quickly shown him will tell of the disfellowship that has crept into the heart! Christ may smile upon the dear disciple as sweetly as ever, but the Church knits her brow and enters her protest against his being the recipient of any more favors from above! *This is Churchianity.*

A few years ago, a brother was attending a camp-meeting held under the auspices of a Church with which he was formerly connected. Said the presiding officer, one day, "Br. P——, I would let you preach *if you had not left our Church.*" And yet that brother had maintained his Christian integrity at every step, and had not even changed his doctrinal views. He had simply changed his Church relations; and the Church-worshiping priests "passed by on the other side." We well know a Christian minister who was recently stationed for two years in a young and thriving city in Western New York. He labored hard, and succeeded in erecting a neat and commodious church edifice for the Society whom he served. The church was built under the floating banner of free seats and free salvation. In less than two years after it was dedicated, that minister, having so far modified his views as to reject the doctrine of man's inherent immortality, was utterly refused the privilege of preaching a single sermon in that

consecrated temple, whose erection cost him travel and toil and tears! *This is Churchianity.* Thank God, that rejected minister has found that all Churches are not prison-houses, and all Christians are not bigots! His heart is cheered by the assurance that falls like heavenly music upon his ear: "Behold, I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it." Churchianity requires me to subscribe to specified creeds and polities; but Christianity overleaps denominational walls, grasps the hand of every genuine lover of Jesus, and shouts the battle on to victory. With Heaven-born impulses, and a heart as broad as all creation, a well-developed Christian rejoices in truth and goodness wherever found, and looks exultingly to that glorious consummation, when all who have been washed in the same blood, and sanctified by the same Spirit, shall stand on the plains of Paradise and sing the same song of endless triumph!

PAUL'S "DESIRE TO DEPART."

Dear Br. Himes: Your kindness in forwarding me a review of the article entitled Paul's "Desire to Depart," which was first published in *The World's Crisis*, and afterward copied into *The Voice of the West*, I duly appreciate, and gladly avail myself of the opportunity you so freely offer, to furnish my reviewer a reply.[1]

In a controversy such as the present I had supposed that an opponent's position could not be successfully assailed without an appeal to "the law and the testimony;" but our friend seems to think differently; and disdaining this old-fashioned custom, has adopted a much quicker, and certainly in the present instance a much easier mode, by substituting bold assertion for forcible argument.

I can assure our friend that those charges against me of "unwarranted dogmatism," of "dishonesty," and "ignorance," with which he has introduced and interspersed his review, have fallen quite harmlessly upon my position, and have led me to suspect that they would not have been preferred if Scriptural argument

[1] The "reviewer" referred to is the Rev. L. Osler, of Providence, R. I., whose reply to Br. Davidson's first article on this question appeared in *The Advent Herald* for January 2, 1869. After some delay we succeeded in getting a copy of this review into Br. Davidson's hands, which elicited this rejoinder, originally designed for the columns of *The Voice of the West*, but finally reserved for these pages.—Ed.

UMI

had been forthcoming, and to wish, for his own sake, that they had been withheld: for in the event of their proving untrue, he must be found in the rather awkward position for a Christian elder to occupy, of having borne "false witness against his neighbor."

The passage under consideration, with its connection, as rendered in our common English version, is as follows:

"For to me to live is Christ, and to die gain. But if I live in the flesh, this is the fruit of my labor: yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better." (Phil. 1: 21-23.)

In my former article my argument rested on what I endeavored to show was the wrong rendering of the phrase in v. 23—"having a desire to depart," which, I contended, should be rendered—"the ardent desire having for the returning," and then the apostle's meaning would be, that though pressed by a martyr's death on the one hand, and a life of tribulation on the other, he longed for *another* event, viz: the returning of Christ, which would be immeasurably better than either of the other alternatives.

But then my authority for rendering *analusai*, by returning being questioned, I reply, as stated in my former article, that the *lexicons* render the word return, and that King James' translators so render it in Luke 12: 36. And, further, that it is impossible to translate the phrase "*eis to analusai*" by to depart, without outraging every law upon which grammatical construction depends. Had *to depart* or *to return* been the way the apostle wished to express himself, I mean the verb in the infinitive mood, then the single word *analusein* was all that was needed or proper to thus express himself. And scholar that he was, he never could have used the phrase "for the departing" to express *to depart:* but if he meant the returning of his Lord whom he so ardently longed to see, he could not have properly expressed himself in any other form than the phrase *eis to analusai*, as we have it in the Greek text. And Dean Alford, whose attainments as a critical Greek scholar none will question, translates the phrase in this very form —"having a desire for the departing and being with Christ." This argument our friend has prudently left untouched.

My reviewer, in harmony with the popular theology, first represents Paul as in doubt and perplexity as to whether he would choose to live on or to die, and being in a strait between these two, viz: life and death, he declares, "*What I shall choose I wot not;*" and yet in the same breath they tell us that he has made a most

deliberate and hearty choice *to depart*, that is *to die:* and having thus taken away *one side of the strait*, he gets out of the perplexity, and his language, "What I shall choose I wot not," is no longer true. And let it be borne in mind, that whatever it is that the apostle desires here, he desires it with his *whole* heart. (*Epithumian*, rendered desire, means *burning* desire, *ardent* longing.) And if my reviewer insists that his own death was the object of the apostle's intense desire here, the easiest way to prove that is to adduce those instances in his writings where he speaks of his own death; and if we find him speaking of it as a *desirable* event, then it may it be that he desires it here. Hear then his testimony on this subject to his brethren at Corinth:

"For we would not, brethren, have you ignorant of our trouble which came upon us in Asia, that we were pressed out of strength, above measure; insomuch that we *despaired* even of life. But we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who *raiseth the dead;* who *delivered* us from so great a *death*, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet *deliver* us." (2 Cor. 1: 8, 9.)

And of his brother and fellow-soldier, Epaphroditus, who "was sick nigh unto death" (Phil. 2: 27), he testifies to God's *mercy* in restoring him from the very event that my reviewer declares Paul desired. And at the close of the apostle's course, when he stood looking the "last enemy" full in the face, his is the language of meek and calm submission to an event that he *cannot avert*, rather than joyous satisfaction that the object of his desire had at last arrived.

"For I am now ready to be offered [or sacrificed], and the time of my departure [dissolution] is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at *that day:* and not to me only, but to all them also who love *his appearing*." (2 Tim. 4: 6-8.)

In his language to the Corinthians, quoted above, when the apostle was so hard pressed by death that he *despaired* of life, he gives our friend little room to suspect that that death from which he so earnestly thanked God for delivering him was the same *event* for which he so ardently longs in his letter to the Philippians. And we here challenge our reviewer to find us *one single sentence* in the fourteen epistles that Paul wrote, that expresses his desire to die, apart from the passage we are considering.

I need not then occupy space in proving that the *coming again*

or *returning* of his Lord was the *chief* desire of the apostle's heart; for our friend has admitted that already. And if we have shown from the apostle's other writings, and even from the very letter to the Philippians itself, that Paul *did not desire* to die, what justification can be offered for interpreting this disputed passage in direct opposition to the apostle's plainly-expressed sentiments elsewhere?

One of the charges of injustice which my friend makes against me he states as follows:

"Now mark, he says *depart* is given in the lexicons as *one* of the meanings of *analuo*, conveying the idea that depart is an exceptional and secondary meaning of the word. The very reverse is true."

And to prove that the reverse is true, or that depart is a *primary* and *radical* meaning, rather than an exceptional and secondary one, as I maintained, he quotes three lexicons: Donnegan's, Liddell & Scott's, and Robinson's. And yet the definitions as written down by my friend himself from the first of these authorities do not mention "depart" at all! The second mentions it the last on the list but one; and the third does not mention it either, unless in New Testament instances; thus admitting that in general Greek literature the word has no such meaning as popular theology attaches to it in the New Testament: so that the charge of "unfairness" and "injustice" must be transferred from my shoulders to the authorities to which our friend has appealed to prove it: for they do not give it even a secondary meaning.

My reviewer quotes McKnight on the word *analuo* as follows:

"On the word *analuo* McKnight says: The simple word *luo* signifies to loose from a port; and the compound word *analuo* to *return* to port."

Now it is the compound *analusai* that occurs in the passage in dispute; and if that word means return, as our friend has quoted McKnight to show, why does he find fault because I have rendered it *return*, in harmony with McKnight's view? And McKnight does not stand alone in so translating it. Liddell & Scott define it return; Hinks, also, defines it return; and the translators of the Bible in James' reign so render it, as we have previously said, in Luke 12: 36—"And ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he *shall return* from the wedding." (*Pote analusei ek toon gamon.*)

My reviewer asserts that the obvious meaning here is to depart, or leave a place: but I think it still *more* obvious that it is not the departing *from* the wedding that is the subject or object of interest to the servants, but the *return* of their lord to his own house: and that this is the correct view is placed beyond doubt by the next sentence—"That when he *cometh* and knocketh." Not when he leaveth, but when he cometh.[1]

Our friend asserts that *analuo* is never used to express Christ's coming, but such words as *parousia*, *apokalupeis*, *epiphania*. True, those different words are used to express his coming, revelation, or manifestation. Sometimes he is spoken of as coming in great power and glory; and of his glorious revelation the apostle was not ignorant. But he needed not to multiply language to express those circumstances, when the simple idea of *return* included them all. The Master's own promise to his disciples was in the simple sentence, "I will come again." And correspondingly simple was the testimony of the angels who witnessed his ascension: "This same Jesus shall so come in like manner."

The conclusion, then, we think, cannot be avoided by any unbiased lover of Bible truth, that the object that Paul desires in Phil. 1: 23 could *not* be his own death, but the *returning* of Christ, which my friend admits to have been the chief desire of the apostle's heart. And for that event his desire would be expressed in earnest, hearty language. And no word in the language he wrote could give expression to a stronger desire than *epithumian*, the word he uses. And then the result, "for that is immensely better"—"the highest superlative which it is possible to form in any language," as our friend has quoted McKnight to show.

But does not Paul say that death is gain? He does. But a

[1] The following extract from Prof. Hudson's remarks on Phil. 1: 21–23 is in point here.—ED. And there are some reasons for supposing that the phrase here rendered "to depart" (*eistoanalusia*) may signify "to return," or "the release," with special allusion to the coming back of the dead from *hades*, of which the early Christians made so much. The verb here used occurs in Luke 12: 36, in the sense of "return." In twenty-two manuscripts of the Septuagint, including the Oxford, it is used in Josh. 22: 9 for the Hebrew word which always signifies "to return." And in Wisd. 2: 1, it occurs in the phrase: "neither was there any man known to have returned from the grave" (*analusas*, better *released*.) In ch. 5: 13: "An arrow . . . . . parteth the air, which immediately cometh together again" (*analithe, returneth*). In ch. 16: 13, 14: "Thou hast power of life and death; thou leadest to the gates of *hades*, and bringest up again. But a man killeth, ... and cannot bring back (*analusei*) the soul received [into *hades*]." In 2 Macc. 8: 33: "Looking time, they returned" (*anelusan*). In ch. 9: 1: "Antiochus returned (*anelithtos*, De Wette, *surueckkehrte*) in a disorderly manner from Persia." In ch. 15: 28: "Now when the battle was done, returning again with joy" (*analusontes*). The noun as used in 2 Tim. 4: 6, may signify "release;" though the context here shows that the hopes of Paul were centered not on the event of death, but of the resurrection. (*Debt and Grace*, pp. 256–7.)

little attention to the context will show that my argument on this point in my former article was scriptural and sound. Paul says in v. 20: "But with all boldness as always so now also Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether by life or death." If Paul lives he labors on in his Master's vineyard, building up his Church, and preaching to perishing sinners the glorious news of life and immortality through Christ; and if he dies a martyr's death, and seals his testimony with his blood, the cause of his adorable Master is still magnified, and gain brought to the Redeemer through the fidelity of his servant.

The apostle was so completely absorbed in his Master's work, that he had no will of his own in the matter; but was entirely prepared for any circumstance that his Master's cause required, whether life or death. But he longed for *another* circumstance, immensely preferable to either life or death: that was the *returning* of Christ, and to be with him.

With language so plain and pointed before my reviewer, can he furnish any honorable reason for his assertion that I placed Paul in a strait between two things: that one of these was Christ's coming, and that the apostle was in doubt and perplexity as to whether he should choose the latter? He has evidently unwavering confidence in the power of misrepresentation to remove difficulties that beset the path he wants to travel; but there is some danger that his readers might prefer a little Scriptural argument. But that seems a rare commodity in our brother's neighborhood.

He also seizes a mere preliminary to the argument stated above, and criticises it as my main argument on this point, although the terms of its introduction show that I regarded it merely as a contingency. I mean the argument that death might in some exceptional cases be a gain, where the living man is the object of fierce persecution, or the subject of severe suffering, and where he would sink into that condition in which, according to Job, "the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest," in the confident hope of living again when Jesus comes. This view, entertained by many of my brethren, and supported by a good array of Scripture, may be correct; yet I laid no stress whatever upon it. The gain that the apostle speaks of I doubt not is precisely similar to that mentioned by Christ in John's last chapter, where he says to Peter, "When thou wast young thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldst: but when thou shalt be old another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldst not."

"This spake he signifying by what death he should *glorify God*." Would it not be gain to Peter thus to glorify God by suffering for his name? Would it not be gain to Paul also to magnify Christ in his body, even by a martyr's death?

My reviewer says: "The use of Christ's language to the Jews reveals either ignorance of Scripture teaching or deceitfulness in handling the word of God;" and asks, "Did he mean to place the wicked Jews on the same footing with the disciples?" Perhaps the reader can solve the problem for himself by just looking at the Savior's words: "As I said unto the Jews, so now say I unto you: Whither I go ye cannot come."

In my simplicity I had supposed these words indicated plainly that the disciples could *not* go whither Jesus has gone, and that to meet their case he had promised, "I will come again and take you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also." If the explanation that our brother offers be the correct one, namely: that the disciples could not then go, but would follow him to heaven at their death, then what need for the promise: "I will come again and take you to myself, *that* where I am there ye may be also," if they would go to him centuries *before* his coming again?

If I were dealing with an ordinary supporter of popular theology he would tell me that Christ came again to each one at his death: but then that would give us thousands of comings; and there only *two* mentioned in the word of truth—the *first* and *second*: and in those two my reviewer professes to believe. The first is past; he is looking for the second, which is still in the future. And though he admits that the coming again is still future, with an unaccountable inconsistency he asserts that the disciples have been received by Christ, although the Lord's words, "I will come again and receive you," connect the two events inseparably together: and from this language no man can legitimately conclude that the disciples are with Christ, unless he can prove that Christ has come again.

It seems to me an awkward position that my friend occupies, to be still looking for the second coming, and yet laboring with his whole might to prove that saints are received by Christ at death, and are with him without his coming again; and consequently the promise, "I will come again and receive you," never was, nor never can be fulfilled to those to whom it was first addressed; nor to the many thousands who have died since the apostle's time: and when he does come he can only fulfill it to

the living, for all the dead were received by him already, each at his own death; and thus the order of the promise has been reversed; for instead of his *coming* to them, they have *gone* to him.

But it will be found uphill work for my friend, even with some orthodox assistance, to reverse and nullify the promise we are considering. For Paul's language to his Thessalonian brethren who were sorrowing for deceased relatives shows most clearly, that the doctrine of being admitted to heaven, or Christ's presence, at death, and of course without a resurrection, had not been invented in his day.

"For we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain shall not prevent [or precede] them who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up *together* with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 15–17.)

Here we find the fulfillment of the promise, "I will come again;" and having come again he finds all his children here. Some like weary watchers have gone to rest, and sleep the sleep that knows no waking till the "trump of God" calls forth the dead; and some on the watchtowers, awake, bearing the burden and heat of the day, with wistful eye and longing heart still pray like the disciples of old, "Thy kingdom come!" But though awake they have no precedence over the sleepers; for "the dead in Christ must rise first," and then the grand company of the redeemed, all changed, the sleepers and the watchers alike, from corruptible to incorruptible, from mortal to immortal, are caught up *together* to meet the Lord in the air: and then from ten thousand immortal tongues roll forth the now heartfelt and appropriate words of Isaiah 25: 9: "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him!"

My reviewer explains to us that the Lord's language to Peter, "Whither I go thou canst not follow me now, but thou shalt follow me afterwards" (John 13: 36), taught him, and teaches us, that at his death he would follow him to another world. Peter could and did follow his Master to death, as according to his own testimony the Lord had previously shown him: "Knowing that shortly I must put off my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." (2 Pet. 1: 11.) But he certainly could not be with his Lord there, for "he rose from the dead," says Paul, "according to the Scriptures." "He was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God," according to Mark, and "was parted from them and carried up into heaven," according to Luke. Did our friend ever read that Peter rose from the dead and was received up into heaven? *No.* Why then ask us to believe it? Why ask us to believe and teach a doctrine that Peter neither believed nor taught? Why take us to task for believing, as did Peter, that the patriarch David is *not* ascended into the heavens? (Acts 2: 34.) Why thrust upon us a dogma of Rome, that she received from Plato, and substituted for the hope that cheered the primitive Christians? viz: the coming of Christ and the "resurrection of the dead," whose faith is to this day revealed by the single Latin word, "*Resurgam*" (I will rise again), so frequently found on their tombs in the catacombs of Rome.

To say that the resurrection was past already in Paul's day was a heresy that he exposed and condemned: but if he lived in our day, he would find a theory very prevalent that can get along quite well without a resurrection; and even if it was past already it would be no great matter. He would discover how simple and ill-instructed he was when he wrote to the Philippians—"If by any means I might attain to the resurrection of the dead." For modern theology could tell him how he could attain to heaven and its glories without a resurrection, and show him how little necessity there was for placing so much dependence on it; as at death he was only separated from his "tabernacle of clay," and lived on in the conscious enjoyment of heavenly happiness until the end of the age, when he would be taken back again to earth and put into a new body; and that would be called the resurrection of Paul. I'm afraid this would astonish the apostle; and reasoning that as he had lived some two thousand years without this new body, might he not have lived forever without it, and never perished whether there was a resurrection or no? And if any of the Corinthians were there, they could hardly help feeling that Paul deceived them when he said, "They also that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished," "if the dead rise not."

My reviewer says:

"No just criticism or explanation of Paul's language can make him a Sadducee on the *nature* of the human spirit, or its condition in death."

Did not the Sadducee deny the *existence* of angels and

spirits, rather than hold erroneous views respecting their *nature?* Did he not also deny the resurrection of the dead? Certainly: and no just criticism of Paul's language can make him a Sadducee in *any* respect; although the efforts of my reviewer and his brethren tend strongly in that direction. For if their views, that Paul and Peter and all other saints can attain to and enjoy heavenly glories without a resurrection from the dead, be correct, then the resurrection is, to say the very least, unnecessary: and should the Sadducee eventually turn out correct, and no resurrection ever take place, what loss, I ask, would saints suffer? Would their life be in danger? No, for that did not depend upon a "resurrection to life." Would their happiness ever be incomplete? No, for being in God's presence, the unerring record testifies, "there is *fullness of joy*, and pleasures for evermore." Who then makes Paul the Sadducee?

In support of his views our friend quotes Paul's language to the Corinthians, "willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." But what he understands by being absent from the body he has not told us. I therefore am left to infer that the popular understanding of the passage is in harmony with his own, viz: that Paul would be absent from the body at death, previous to the resurrection. But the apostle's language both to Titus and Timothy does not give much countenance to the idea that he expected to be present with the Lord during the time that he was a *subject of death.* To Titus he says, "Looking for that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." (ch. 2: 13.) It was the glorious appearing of Jesus Christ that the apostle was looking for at the end of his career, rather than to be with the Lord *before* his appearing. And to Timothy he says (2 Tim. 4: 6): "The time of my *analusis* [dissolution] is at hand. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown, which the Lord the righteous Judge will give me at *that day:* and not to me only, but unto all them also who love his *appearing.*"

Here again the appearing is the only object of comfort to the apostle. But if he cherished another and more immediate ground of comfort, that of being immediately admitted to Christ's presence at death, why does he not intimate it to his beloved Timothy? Is not his silence to be explained by believing that he knew of no such comfort? but had his confidence (as he had previously said to the Corinthians) in "God, who raiseth the dead," and almost at

the close of this letter to Timothy, the last he ever wrote (2 Tim. 4: 18), he says: "The Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and *will preserve* me unto his heavenly kingdom."

Paul knew that the death which was now approaching him was a dissolution of the man, a "returning of the dust to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it;" and hence his trust that God would preserve him unto his heavenly kingdom: and this language clearly indicates that Paul's spirit was with God before Paul was conceived, or born; and, also, that the matter or dust was in the earth before it was organized into the man Paul, and vitalized by the spirit or breath of life: for neither the one nor the other could return to where they had never been. And if Paul possessed no conscious existence previous to his being organized, by what law of logic are we to hold that when he becomes *disorganized* by death he can still retain his consciousness?

The Psalmist, speaking of the beasts (Ps. 104: 29), says: "Thou takest away their spirit [or breath], they die and return to their dust." So God takes away the spirit of the beast, as well as man. But does it therefore follow that because the spirit of life that God only can give to animal as well as man, is said to return to him, or be taken away by him, the being it animated returns too, and lives on, having simply changed one kind of life for another, rather than life for death?

But what does the passage in 2 Cor. 5 mean?

I think ordinary attention to the context would show that the apostle is comparing the present mortal and corruptible condition with the immortal and incorruptible; and earnestly desires the one to replace the other, that, as he expresses it, "mortality might be swallowed up of life." The phraseology the apostle employs when compared with similar language that he elsewhere uses, clearly shows that he is here considering two states, or conditions of being, and *two only:* and that these two are the *temporal* and the *eternal* (ch. 4: 18), not the temporal and the *intermediate*, as my reviewer teaches. "*Not* that we would be unclothed," says Paul. He had no notion of the unclothed or disembodied state that the hymn-books tell us so much about now-a-days; but looked forward to the perfect and eternal state, when the corruptible should have put on incorruption, and the mortal immortality. Then the saying would be brought to pass, "Death is swallowed up of victory!" Or, as he here expresses it, "mor-

tality swallowed up of life." Then should Paul not only be *present* with the Lord, but be ever with him.

I presume my reviewer will admit that the saints who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord will be present *then* with him for the *first* time: and Paul does not expect to be present any sooner; for his own testimony is, "We who are alive and remain shall be caught up *together* with them [the risen ones] to meet the Lord in the air; and so we shall ever be with the Lord."

Another passage cited by my friend in support of his view is 2 Cor. 12: 3:

"Whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth."

Drowning men are said to catch at straws; and perhaps it were cruel to remove such slender support: but unwilling to leave our brother trusting to a broken reed, I would ask him to notice a sentence of the apostle's first letter to the same people, which explains his meaning here.

"For I verily as *absent in body* but *present in spirit* have judged already concerning him that hath done this deed." (1 Cor. 5: 3.)

Now here it is far more clearly taught that it was possible for the apostle to be present *without* his body than in the passage my friend has quoted. But the meaning in the one being so obvious, and giving so little countenance to the idea that he labors to establish, he seizes the other; which we think would be more wisely left in the uncertainty in which the apostle left it, and say, "We cannot tell: God knoweth," rather than deduce from it a doctrine, popular indeed in the Romish as well as the Mohammedan and Pagan world, but unknown, we think, to the Bible: we mean the doctrine that a man can *think* and *act* and *feel* during the time that he is a subject of death.

And now, in conclusion, permit me to say, that the foregoing are my views, as far as I have had room in a single article to state them, on the various subjects treated. And I confidently leave your readers (Bible in hand) to say whether or no they are well founded. I have not adopted them at the *ipse dixit* of any man, but from a careful and prayerful personal study of the word, I have been irresistibly borne to the conclusion that they are the "mind of the Spirit." And whilst aware that we are boldly characterized by some of our friends who maintain popular theology as dishonest and dangerous men, for contending somewhat

earnestly for what we believe to be "the faith once delivered to the saints," we will not nor wish not to retaliate: for experience has convinced us that hard names seldom soften men's prejudices, or convince their judgments. The Christianity that consists in imitating Christ (and no other deserves the name) has taught us a *better* way; and though in this imperfect and mortal state we may never see eye to eye, still we can express our differences in the Master's spirit, and long for the time when gathered from the four winds of heaven we "shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom," and brought by the Almighty arm of a tender Father to our eternal home, we shall go out no more forever.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The terms "kingdom of God" and "kingdom of heaven" are synonymous; and are used interchangeably by the inspired penman. Matthew with few exceptions using the latter, and the other evangelists exclusively the former. It is a fundamental term as used in the Bible, and its definite import is of vast importance to a correct understanding of the Scriptures. But what clear idea can be conceived of it by those who make it to signify the gospel; and the gospel dispensation; a state of grace in the heart; the Christian Church; a spiritual reign of Christ here; and the heavenly world hereafter?

That such a term should be used in a sense so vague, is hardly supposable when we reflect that the writers were Divinely inspired, and speaking of subjects of so grave a nature, as involve the eternal destinies of men. And should not a latitude of interpretation so great awaken of itself serious doubts of its correctness? While its tendency is to destroy all distinctive ideas of the kingdom, it throws wide open the doors for infidelity, and renders quite meaningless the most solemn declarations of the Bible, excluding unrenewed men from the "kingdom of God."

The nearer we can keep to a clear, definite, and literal interpretation of the Bible, the safer we are. A careful examination of all the fulfilled prophecies cannot fail to convince any one of this fact. Take for example those touching the first advent;

UMI

and did their fulfillment show that any of them were to be understood as mere figures of speech? Did they terminate in anything short of a literal accomplishment, even when of such a nature as would have seemed impossible?

It was predicted that Christ should be born of a virgin; that he should be called out of Egypt; that he should ride upon a colt on which man never sat; that he should be reproached, and afflicted; led as a lamb to the slaughter; be scourged, condemned, and put to death. Yet what a literal fulfillment do we have of these prophecies, as also of all the minute details of his crucifixion, burial, and resurrection!

And if prophecy failed in nothing of a literal fulfillment touching his humiliation, his sufferings, and death, why should it fail of this, pertaining to his glory? If Peter stood terribly rebuked when in reference to his suffering death he said, "This be far from thee, Lord;" may not we also be, should we say the same respecting the literal establishment of his kingdom and reign? If the deep humiliation was kept to the very letter of the word, why not the great exaltation and glory? If to fulfill the prophecy, he shall make "his grave" with "the rich in his death," the Son of God must die, and lay his lifeless form in the dark, cold tomb of Joseph, how shall that prophecy be fulfilled which says, "The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David: he will not turn from it: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne?" (Ps. 132: 11.) When "this same Jesus" that was taken up into heaven "shall so come in like manner as he went "into heaven" (Acts 1: 11), and there shall be given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom (Dan. 7: 14), may he not "according to the flesh" (Acts 2: 30), that is as the legal heir, sit upon "the throne of his father David, and reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there be no end?" (Luke 1: 32, 33.)

The latter is predicted with a clearness and precision far exceeding the former, with no intimation but what it will be just as actual. The fact that Christ ascended bodily to heaven "with all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature,"[1] that the heavens now retain him, and that he will come again in his glorified humanity, is a fact more than suggestive of an ulterior design yet to be accomplished. Christ will be in his

[1] Meth. Dis., Art. 3.

kingdom bodily: and "if nothing else gave locality to heaven," as Richard Watson says, "this would."

With Christ's kingdom then a locality, and he a king descended from the royal house of David, with the Father's oath giving him David's throne; and his coming, and reign, and kingdom, all synchronizing together, should it not awake an earnest inquiry whether these things are all to culminate in mere figures of speech; or whether when he comes and "swallows up death in victory," he will not personally over the true Israel "reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously?" (Is. 24: 23.)

The term kingdom embraces of necessity the idea of territory, of subjects, and a king. Properly these must all be existing together, or we can have no kingdom. And may we suppose that Christ's kingdom will fail in any of these essential elements? May it not after all be just as real and tangible as other kingdoms, and thus have its literal fulfillment? And does not the term as used in the Scriptures always have reference directly or indirectly to that state of things where Christ shall be personally present with his people reigning over them in everlasting life? Is it not that state of things John saw, when he that sat upon the throne said, "Behold, I make all things new?" (Rev. 21: 5.) "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." "And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain." These things used to be, but are now no more; for it is added, "the former things are passed away." A new and everlasting dispensation of things has come. The "kingdom has come," and God's "will is done in earth as it is in heaven."

The kingdom of God as announced by John and Christ was a term readily understood in its main features by their hearers, and needed no word of explanation as something new and before unheard of. The expectation of the Jew that Christ was to establish a kingdom, and be in it personally and reign a king, is not so easily shown to have been an error. That they overlooked his coming first to die, and narrowed their views of his reign down to men in the flesh, was where they stumbled and fell. For the prophets, and Christ, and the apostles all speak of the kingdom of God as being just as real, and visible, as any earth-

ly kingdom, and as to succeed all other kingdoms, being established over all the earth in an immortal state; Christ its king, the redeemed of all ages its subjects, and the world renewed its territory. This I understand to be the definite import of the term "kingdom of God."

When John and Christ preached, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand," it certainly could have had no force, and no meaning to the minds of their hearers, unless it harmonized with the teachings of the Jewish Scriptures. Much less could a doctrine new, and unexplained, have been urged as the ground of immediate repentance and faith. And as the very terms they used were those employed by the prophet Daniel, it seems unreasonable to suppose the kingdom to be any other than Daniel's fifth monarchy; called the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven, because the God of heaven sets it up.

Now to suppose this kingdom is the gospel, or gospel dispensation, is to mistake the shadow for the substance, and fall utterly short both of the spirit and letter of the word of God. Christ was wont to call the gospel "this gospel of the kingdom." Literally the good news of the kingdom. He preached "the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye therefore and believe the gospel;" believe this "good news." But the good news of a thing cannot be the thing itself. And if we confound them, do we not err?

Again, if the gospel be the kingdom, what motive could be drawn from its being at hand why men should repent now? an idea at once involving the assurance that a time more favorable for repentance than the present was to come. Elsewhere the Savior directly urges repentance and faith on the ground of eternal salvation or damnation. "Repent, or ye shall all likewise perish;" he that believeth not shall be damned. Paul urges the same motive when he says, "But God now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." And repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand, must have involved in it the same idea. And this idea we have when we admit that it means not the gospel, but the kingdom of God to come, in an immortal state. To enter this kingdom a man must "repent," must "be converted" and become as a little child; and he "must be born again."

But further, how could the kingdom mean the gospel? for it

is an undeniable fact that the Gospel had already come. Christ himself testifies: "The law and the prophets were until John," no longer; "since that time the kingdom of God is preached." Is preached subjectively. The preaching being itself the gospel, and the kingdom the subject of its proclamation.

These considerations certainly should settle the fact, that the gospel and the kingdom are two very distinct things. The one is the good news of the other. The one warns us to repent and prepare for the other. The one shows us what we must do, and what we must be, ever to enter the other.

In the prophecy of Daniel (ch. 2: 31–35) we have the monarchies of this world—and in them its history—symbolized by a great image, whose head of gold dated back to near the flood, and whose feet and toes of clay and iron reach onward to the end of all worldly kingdoms. Thus spanning by his prophetic form their entire duration—the whole of this present state of things—and to be followed in their utter overthrow by another kingdom, called the kingdom of God.

Now does this fifth kingdom have its fulfillment in the gospel dispensation? A strong argument might be drawn from Scriptural analogy that would lead us to conclude not. Three grand historic periods, or marked stages of existence called "worlds," are assigned in the Bible to our earth.

We have "the heavens and the earth before the flood," called "*the world* that then was." In that world there appear to have been no kingdoms. Men were sinners exceedingly, and its termination was marked by physical changes, involving its wicked inhabitants in utter destruction. God destroyed it with a flood of waters.

Then comes the present *world*, "the heavens and earth which are now." These the apostle tells us are "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men.' (1 Pet. 3: 7.) The present world is a world of kingdoms; and the image spans their entire duration. The destruction of the image symbolizes the destruction of these kingdoms, which will only be in the destruction of this world. This will bring us to the kingdom of God; the "*world to come;*" the "new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

A careful examination of the whole prophecy should convince the earnest seeker after truth, that nothing short of earth's closing scenes are here brought to view. If the "stone cut out of

the mountain without hands," which destroyed this image, had been Christ in his first advent, should not the specified point of contact with the image have been very different? Both prophetic truth and historic fact required—if the gospel be meant by the stone—that the point of contact designated should have been the legs of the image. Here was the exact time in which Christ first came. Rome was then in the glory of her iron age; and never stronger than when she issued her "decree, that all the world should be taxed." And before we reach the feet of the image, this whole empire in its undivided form became nominally a Christian empire. And yet the prophet declares that the "stone smote the image upon his feet." Was he mistaken? or are our modern theologians? Hence I affirm that the gospel dispensation, in any form, cannot be the event the prophet here predicts.

The feet and toes of the image, part of potter's clay and part of iron, represent the nations as they have been since the breaking up of the Roman empire. The prophet carries us on in the history of the world, down past the legs of iron, to the very feet and toes of the image. And it is not until we arrive here that the "stone" smites the image at all. And when it does it "smites the image upon his feet." And that God meant just this exactly, is made certain by the very definite manner of its being stated; "*upon his feet*," says the prophet, "*which were of iron*, and *clay*." There was no clay in the legs, and no feet until long after the first advent: the image existing only in the developments of history. As such it is represented as standing in all the glory of its successive reigns, living out its day undisturbed, until suddenly it is smitten, utterly destroyed, and swept from the face of the earth.

There is no two thousand years presented here of weary grinding away at this image with but comparative results. No "little stone" described as "rolling gradually onward and onward, increasing and increasing, more and more, until at last it becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth." When this kingdom of the stone comes, it smites the image with terrible and irresistible power. The whole scene is changed as in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. The kingdoms of this world are broken to pieces together, and become as the chaff of the summer threshing floors, and the wind carries them away that no

place is found for them. Then it is that the kingdom of God is established under the whole heaven and fills the whole earth.

The interpretation of the vision by the prophet presents us with the same leading ideas. "And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided." These divisions were to "mingle themselves with the seed of men"—be scattered over the earth—"and cleave not one to another," or become again a consolidated monarchy. "And in the days of these kings," or kingdoms, the very ones resulting from the divisions of the Roman Empire, and now existing upon the earth as shadowed forth by the toes of the image, "shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom."

Nothing can be made plainer, than that the prophet carries us down the stream of time to the world as it now is, with its varied dynasties, and having brought us here, and as standing in our midst he says, "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." Something entirely new and manifestly different from what ever has been. "And it shall not be left to other people." Can this be said of a kingdom where death is? Nay. "It shall not be left to other people."

"Life from the dead is in that word,
'T is immortality."

"It shall stand forever," the same kingdom, the same people, "forever with the Lord."

But not only does the chronology of the event determine its character, but also the manner of its accomplishment. "Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet which were of iron and clay and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors. And the wind carried them away that no place was found for them." The interpretation says, "shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and shall stand forever." Now does such language as this imply the conversion of men to God? Does it indicate the gracious drawings, and melting influences of the gospel, and the grace of God upon the human heart, by which the sinner is won to Christ?

But further, does the spread of the gospel in the world brake in pieces and destroy human governments? Does all history give us one solitary example? Rather are not human governments

cemented and strengthened by the intelligence and virtue implanted, and the loyalty imposed by the gospel? And do we not as a nation to-day owe our salvation under God directly to that love of country and right which the gospel would implant in every human heart? Hence we say the event here predicted does not indicate the progress of the gospel in the world.

But it does indicate the final judgment-day; the judgment of God upon the wicked, in the end of the world. They are the "chaff which the wind driveth away." "The wicked shall be driven away in his wickedness." And when Christ comes and gathers the wheat into the garner, he "burns up the chaff with unquenchable fire." And can we reasonably suppose that any other event will ever make an end of all human governments, as Daniel positively predicts there will be, when this kingdom shall be revealed? Most certainly not. Such a view would stand opposed to all present ideas of men.

But the prophet does not leave us here. In the seventh chapter we have the same history presented, only more fully, by four great beasts which came up out of the sea. The last beast has ten horns denoting the divisions of the fourth kingdom, the same as the feet and toes of clay and iron in the image; with yet another horn, denoting the Papal power. This view is sanctioned by every Protestant writer of any note. And what is the character or nature of the kingdom brought to view here? Does not its ushering in harmonize precisely with the judgment-day in other Scriptures? We have the same grand Assize as presented by Christ and John, in the New Testament. It perfectly harmonizes in all its leading features, its details, and its results. We have alike Christ coming in the clouds of heaven, the judge, and the throne; the vast ministering and attending host; the innumerable multitudes arraigned before the judge; the opening of the books, and the awarding of each and all according to their works. The righteous inherit a kingdom, and the wicked are consigned to the burning flame.

And these adjudications are presented as final and eternal. The saints it is said "shall possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever" (Dan. 7: 18); and the wicked are consigned to shame and everlasting contempt. (Dan. 12: 2.)

The saints here are not either ordinary saints in the flesh. Dr. Clarke says the original "signifies pre-eminent saints," or rather "the holy ones." They are in the kingdom of God, and flesh and blood cannot inherit it. They are the resurrection saints. They are those whom the angel tells us in the interpretation of the vision "sleep in the dust of the earth"—the saints of all ages—"that awake to everlasting life, and shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever."

The kingdom in the seventh chapter corresponds to the same in the second: Christ coming in the clouds of heaven, to the "stone" cut out without hands; and the destruction of the image and the beast, the one driven away as the chaff, and the other given to the burning flame, is all in perfect harmony with the judgment-day of the New Testament. Now to claim that such terms are employed to indicate the conversion of men to God and the spread of the gospel in the world, certainly presents a very strange anomaly in Scriptural exegesis. Hereafter when we read in the New Testament of Christ's coming in the clouds of heaven, and in "flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God and obey not the gospel;" that "every eye shall see him" and the wicked "wail because of him," crying to the "rocks fall on us, and to the hills cover us," we have only to understand that Christ and Paul and John are borrowing some of Daniel's impressive figures, to show how the sweet and melting influences of the gospel will yet subdue and win the hearts of men from the world and sin to the Savior!

But such is the absurdity of this, that we are compelled to believe that Daniel just the same as Christ and Paul and John is predicting a kingdom in an immortal state. Their testimony is a unit. The witnesses all agree as touching this very thing. Daniel has Christ coming in the "clouds of heaven," the "judgment," and "the kingdom." Paul says "he shall *judge* the quick and dead, at his *appearing* and *kingdom*." The Savior tells us that in the end of this world, he will "gather out of his kingdom all things that offend and them which do iniquity, and cast them into a furnace of fire: . . . . . then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." And when "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ," at the same time, John tells us, "the time of the dead comes" that "they should be judged," and rewarded. (Rev. 11: 15–18.) And is there not agreement here?

THE KINGDOM "AT HAND."

But if such be the nature of the kingdom, how could it be said

to have been "at hand" by Christ and the apostles in their day? "At hand" is a term that may have a greater or less latitude of meaning, according to the greatness or uncommonness of the event to which it is applied. While with no propriety could it be said of a clock, "The time of its striking is at hand," though but thirty minutes might yet be wanting; we could very justly say of a young man that "the time of his majority is at hand," though several years might still be lacking of the event.

That our Savior used the term in its broader import is proved from the fact that he distinguishes between its use as "*at hand*" and "*nigh at hand.*" When his coming should approach within the circle of a generation, he changes the form of expression, and tells us by the given signs to know that the kingdom of God is *nigh at hand*, even at the doors. (Luke 21: 31; Matt. 24: 33.)

In the broader sense, the kingdom of God was "at hand" in the series of events or kingdoms. God had shown by the prophet Daniel that four great universal monarchies should arise, and rule over the earth. That these should all be swept away and give place to a fifth called the kingdom of God, that should be "set up" and "stand forever." When then three of these had arisen and had their day, and the fourth had come and reached its zenith of power and glory, what was the next great monarchy "at hand?" Was it not the fifth, the kingdom of God? And did it not become the king elect then standing in the midst of these rebellious rulers, to utter in their ears the warning voice, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand?" "Be wise, O ye kings, and be instructed ye judges of the earth, kiss the son lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little." For it is written "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." (Ps. 2: 8–12.)

But again the kingdom was "at hand" in reference to the different dispensations and ages of the world. Paul clearly teaches us in the fourth of Hebrews, that the Sabbath is typical of "the rest that remaineth to the people of God." This would carry along with it the idea that the creation days symbolized the periods during which Christ would be perfecting the work of human redemption, preparatory to the eternal Sabbath of rest. And with the same propriety that it may be said on Friday that

we are in the last days of the week, that the Sabbath is at hand, it was declared of the gospel days that they were "the last days," and that "the kingdom of God," and "the end of all things," was "at hand."

Now that our Savior used it in this sense instead of its being at hand in reference to the lives of them that heard him, is evident from the fact that when some were led to believe that his kingdom should immediately appear, he corrected the error. But how did he do it? Did he do it by telling them that they altogether misunderstood the nature of his kingdom? that it was not an actual kingdom in which he personally would be present and reign; but simply a reign of grace in the hearts of believers; a spiritual kingdom consisting in the spread of the gospel in the world and a yielding of the hearts of men to its claims? Nay, verily. But he confirmed that very idea of the personality of his reign which they entertained, by an illustration, that most positively teaches it.

He spake this parable because they thought the kingdom of God should immediately appear. (Luke 19: 11.) A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return. He gave ten pounds to his servants, saying, Occupy till I come. But his citizens hated him and sent a message after him saying, We will not have this man to reign over us. And it came to pass when he was returned, having received the kingdom, that he calls those servants and reckons with them. And those mine enemies, he says, who would not that I should reign over them, bring them here and slay them before me.

Now when did this nobleman establish his kingdom, and commence his reign? Was it when he was gone to receive his kingdom? or was it when he had returned having received his kingdom and overthrown his enemies? And in this order of events do not Christ and Daniel agree? Why then should we look for a kingdom in any form before the returning king?

SOME OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

It is objected that there are texts that do teach, that Christ's kingdom has already been established. I will examine those most relied upon and see if they really thus affirm.

"Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here that shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom;" or "shall see the kingdom of God come with power." (Matt. 16: 28; Mark 9: 1.)

UMI

Few texts have been more generally misapplied or misunderstood than this. It is looked upon as proof positive, by many, that Christ's kingdom must have been set up during the lifetime of certain who then heard him. And they have cast about them to find the kingdom. They discover, that as Christ reigns in the hearts of believers, that this is the kingdom. But if this be so, did not Abel who had the "witness that he was righteous," and Enoch also who for three hundred years walked with God—having "this testimony, that he pleased him"—have the kingdom in them just as much as we?

"But the gospel is the kingdom," says one. But does not Paul tell us that God "preached the gospel before unto Abraham?" And that to the Israelites "was the gospel preached as well as unto us?" And does not the whole Christian Church admit that the covenant made with Abraham and the gospel covenant, are one and the same covenant? Where then does the kingdom come in? "Ah, but the kingdom is spiritual, and invisible, is not to be seen." But does not this falsify the text which declares, "it shall be seen?"

Three of the Evangelists quote this text; and in every case they proceed at once to give an account of the Transfiguration, as though this had something to do with its fulfillment. Not as a full and final accomplishment of the prophecy, but as a gracious and incontestable proof that Christ was the true Messiah, and that his coming and kingdom were no cunningly devised fable. The Savior here had been telling his disciples, that they could not be his, unless they forsook all, took up their cross, and followed him. He assures them that if they lost their lives for his sake they should find them again. But if for the present world they rejected him, they would lose all in the end. "And what," he asks them, "shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul:" "for the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works." Then comes in the text.

Now for the disciples to trust in Christ who stood among them as a man; to trust in him who had been born among them and grown up with them, as being in very deed the Son of God who should sit in final judgment on them and on the world, required no common evidence. Not only was this life, but eternal life involved in the question of his being, or not being a deceiver.

This evidence Christ assures them they shall have; and it is this evidence the text promises.

Right upon this we have the scene of the Transfiguration. His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. Moses and Elias appeared with him in glory, and *he was seen* by the three disciples as in a "vision" "coming in his kingdom." In this "vision" (Matt. 17: 9) he was seen by them as he will be seen by all men, when he shall come to judge the world, and set up his kingdom.

Peter, who saw this, tells us, that Christ's coming is no cunningly devised fable. But why may it not be? Where is the proof? He points us directly to the Transfiguration, as proof positive. "We have not followed cunningly devised fables," he says, "when we made known unto you the *power* and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty—a kingly term and title. For he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven, we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." (2 Pet. 1: 16–18.)

The disciples here saw Christ coming in his kingdom in miniature. They saw him, but with the living reality, as we see our friends in the photograph. And they looked upon it as certain proof of his final coming in the end of the world. And they bore witness of this truth, to the end of their lives. "Behold," says John, "he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him." "The day of the Lord," says Peter, "will come as a thief in the night." "Be patient, brethren," says James, "unto the coming of the Lord, ... for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

"For behold the kingdom of God is within you." (Luke 17: 21.)

This is a text often quoted to prove that Christ's kingdom is spiritual, and exists in the hearts of men. It is hardly supposable, however, that our Savior in one breath would tell these Pharisees, "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in you," and that "they were of their father the devil," and call them "serpents and a generation of vipers," and in the next tell them that the kingdom of God was in them! Neither are we to understand our Savior as uttering a general truth as to the location of the kingdom of God. The whole question is made to turn upon the manner of its coming. The marginal reading is, "among you,"

not "in you." This gives it a very different meaning. The Pharisees demanded of Christ no doubt derisively "when the kingdom of God should come." The Savior's reply shows that when it comes all will know it. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say lo here! or lo there!" And turning to his disciples he says, "the days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man"—the same as the kingdom—"and shall not see it. And they shall say to you see here, or see there"—is the kingdom—"go not after them, nor follow them; for as the lightning that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall also the Son of man be in his day." So shall the kingdom of God come. It will come suddenly, and manifestly to all as the lightning from heaven. When it comes it will be among you like the lightning; and all will know it without a "lo here!" or a "lo there!"

"My kingdom is not of this world." (John 18: 36.)

This text is triumphantly quoted by many to prove that Christ's kingdom now exists in the earth, but that it is spiritual, and invisible, only seen in the spread of the gospel in the world.

Now we must aver that this is not the meaning here of Jesus Christ. His kingdom is not of this world, inasmuch as it is not a worldly kingdom, but really a heavenly one. It is not of this world or age, but of the world or age to come. He says, "but now is my kingdom not from hence." That is it is not from this place or from this time, as would be the fact did it exist in this dispensation, in anything more than a preparatory state of formation.

The Jews accused Christ to Pilate of claiming to be a king. "We found this fellow," say they, "forbidding to give tribute to Cæsar, saying that he himself is Christ, a king." When questioned by Pilate he denied not, but as Paul says "witnessed a good confession" to this very title—"*Thou sayest* that I am a king." To the high priest he says: "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven." Daniel says: I saw "one like the son of man," and "he came with the clouds of heaven," and "there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom;" not of this world, but in the end of this world, heavenly and immortal.

Dr. Clarke quotes from Eusebius on this text, that "the relatives of our Lord were brought before Domitian, and interrogated whether they were of the family of David; and what the kingdom of Christ was and when it would appear. "They answered that "his kingdom was heavenly and angelical, and that it would not take place till the end of the world." They did not understand that his kingdom had already come, neither should we. The Scriptures intimate no such idea; but make his coming and kingdom synchronize together; and they are chronologically fixed by the inspired penman to take place in the end of this world, in connection with the resurrection and the judgment.

"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." (Rom. 14: 17.)

This text, though usually interpreted otherwise, is in perfect harmony with the idea of a future kingdom. Righteousness, peace, and joy are elements of the kingdom; but do not of themselves alone constitute the kingdom. Just as when it is said "God is love;" love is an element of the divine character, but of itself is not God. No one mistakes here; why should they of the meaning of the text? It is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" that will constitute the bliss of the kingdom, even as their own poets have sung—

"To dwell with God, to taste his love,
Is the full heaven enjoyed above."

"Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son." (Col. 1: 13.)

This text is most evidently a prolepsis. God often "calls things that are not as though they were." Thus God said to Abaaham, "I have made thee a father of many nations," when as yet he had not a son to his name. And so Isaiah spoke of the coming Redeemer: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given," though ages were to intervene before its fulfillment. And in the text those who have a meetness for the heavenly inheritance, are spoken of as having already entered upon it. Hence it is said, that "whom he justified, them he also glorified." But are all the justified saints glorified? They are just as near to that state, as they are to being in the kingdom. Again it is said, "and to wait for his Son from heaven, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." The wrath to come is the wrath of the judgment-day. The deliverance spoken of must be

UMI

proleptical: it cannot be actual and final, until the day of wrath comes. It is in this same strain of anticipating the heavenly kingdom and glory, that the apostle says, we "are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." But the "*receiving*" of the "kingdom" he puts in connection with the shaking of the heavens and the earth, and "the removing of those things that may be shaken;" thus bringing us to the glorified and eternal state.

THE PARABLES ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE KINGDOM.

All the parables of our Savior, illustrative of the kingdom of God, bring into view this same kingdom, and no other. Some show the sacrifices that must be made to gain it; while the greater part teach that only certain characters, the pure and the good, will ever enter it. They are but an enforcement of his solemn words, "Except a man be born again," "except he be converted and become as a little child," he "cannot enter the kingdom of God."

The great mistake is in supposing that the parables *illustrate the gospel* instead of the *kingdom*. If Christ had said "the *gospel* is likened" unto such and such things, then might we well look to see how his parables illustrate the gospel. But he never does this. He says the "*kingdom of God*" *is* "*likened unto*" such and such things. "The kingdom" is the great end and design of the Savior's teachings. And it is our duty to apply the parables in our endeavors to understand them, to the kingdom, as he himself has done.

In the parable of the tares and wheat, as also in that of the net and the fishes, the final destiny if the two classes of mankind is what illustrates the "kingdom of God." We have unmistakably here the winding up of all human probation. The tares are burned," and the "wheat" garnered; the "good fishes are put in vessels," and the "bad cast away." And here is where the kingdom comes in—"THEN shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear."

We have too the same great truth presented in the "kingdom of heaven" being "likened" to a marriage feast; to the wise and foolish virgins; and to the servants to whom were distributed the talents. Those only were admitted to the feast who had on the wedding garment; who had oil in their vessels with their lamps; and those servants only who had improved upon their talents entered into their Master's joy. And here is where they illustrate the kingdom of God. A preparation is needful to enter there; and all who neglect to make it, will find themselves excluded from it at the last. (Luke 13: 24–29.)

Our Savior says:

"The kingdom of heaven is like leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened." (Matt. 13: 33.)

The kingdom of God here is usually taken to mean either the grace of God in the heart, or the spread of the gospel in the world. But does it really mean either? Can a person have the grace of God in his heart, and it be hid; not be manifest? Is he not to confess Christ openly; to let his light shine; and be a living epistle, read and known of all men?

And is not the spread of the gospel in the world just as clear to the gaze of men, as the light of the sun; and may we not just as well talk of one being "hid" as the other?

But when we come to the kingdom of God as revealed by Daniel, what is seen of that? Aye, what is seen of that kingdom? God has been preparing its subjects in every age; so silently, so unperceived—like the leaven in the meal—has the work gone on that the monarchs of this world have been startled by no alarms; awakened by no apprehensions of impending danger. And still hidden will it go on, "till the whole is leavened"—the last child of promise redeemed—when the coming king will be heralded by the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God; the thrones and dynasties of the world will be swept away, and Jesus and his "saints take the kingdom, and possess it forever, even forever and ever."

"Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed which a man took and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." (Matt. 13: 31, 32.)

To assume that this parable illustrates the spread of the gospel, or increase of the Christian Church in the world, is but begging the whole question. Had the Savior said the *gospel* is like the mustard seed, its application would have been clear. But he declares, the *kingdom of heaven* is like the mustard seed; hence

it becomes our duty to see how it illustrates—not the gospel—*but the kingdom.* The mustard seed in the parable refers to the subjects of the kingdom. In every age they have been, as compared to the subjects of worldly kingdoms, the least of all: but as the mustard seed to other seeds.

He further contrasts the subjects of the kingdom as seen here, with them as they will appear in the kingdom. It is not the *growth* of the mustard that is taken to illustrate the growing of a kingdom; but the *seed* with its perfected condition. He compares the littleness of the seed with the greatness of the tree. As a seed it is the least, "but when it is *grown*," when it is perfected, it is the greatest of all. So with the kingdom. Its realm will be, "the kingdom and dominion and greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven." It subjects, "the saints of the Most High," a "multitude which no man can number," like "the stars of heaven, and the sands upon the seashore innumerable."

The varied expressions "the kingdom of God is come to you;" "is come upon you;" "is come nigh to you;" have in them simply the idea, that it has come beforehand to you. That is, it has come to you in its offers of acceptance; it has come upon you in its evidences of reality and power, by which it will be established, in that I now show you that I have the power to raise the dead, and cast out devils. It has come nigh to you inasmuch as its king elect is now in your very midst, in the very realm he will claim for his empire, and swallowing up death in victory,

> ——"will reign where'er the sun
> Does his successive journeys run."

Repent therefore, for its foreshadowings are now upon you.

This kingdom is the golden age, and only hope of the Church. It is

> "The grand millennial reign begun,"

the eternal Sabbath of rest. It is the "restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all God's holy prophets since the world began." Short of this there is no hope in the Bible, none in the history of this world's progress. Such is man's fallen nature, such the plague-spot of sin ever breaking out afresh; such is natural and moral evil cleaving to all things earthly, that we can hope for nothing permanently good and pure, until the curse shall be removed, the enemy death destroyed, and mortality swallowed up of life. The strong man will keep his house

in all safety, until a stronger than he shall come and bind him, and cast him out and destroy his goods.

All hope of deliverance centers in the coming of the Seed of Abraham, the Son of David; in him whose right it is to reign. Who shall take to himself his great power, wrest the kingdom from the angry nations, and judge and rule the earth in righteousness. Then shall end the long weary night that has hung over our poor sin-stricken world. A sun shall rise upon her that shall no more go down. The voice of weeping shall no more be heard in her, nor the voice of crying, for the days of her mourning shall be ended. The whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge and glory of God, even as the waters cover the sea. No sin, no death, no curse. The kingdom has come, and God's will is done in earth as it is in heaven. All tears are wiped from the eyes of his weeping saints. They are gathered to their beautiful home—gathered "from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God."

"Watchman, what of the night?" Are we not rapidly nearing the time when this glorious day shall be ushered in? When Jesus Christ preached the kingdom of God "*at hand*," did he not instruct us that the watchful servants should "KNOW" when it was "NIGH AT HAND"—nigh, even at the very doors? even as when the fig tree putteth forth its tender leaves we know that summer is near? "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

AN APPROACHING CHANGE.—*The North British Review*, discoursing on the doom of the world, has the following remarks:

"What this change is we dare not even conjecture; but we see in the heavens themselves some traces of destructive elements and some indications of their annihilative power. The fragments of broken planets, the descent of meteoric stones upon our globe, the whirling comets wielding their loose material at the solar surface, the volcanic eruptions in our own satellite, the appearance of new stars, and the disappearance of others, are all foreshadows of that impending convulsion to which the world is doomed. Thus placed on a planet which is to be burnt up, and under heavens which are to pass away; thus residing, as it were, on cemeteries and dwelling upon mausoleums of former worlds, let us learn the lessons of humility and wisdom, if we have not already been taught in the school of revelation."

UMI

LIFE AND DEATH.

"The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6: 23.)

Of all words none have for the human race so transcendent an interest as those little monosyllables life and death. They are the terms which are used in Scripture to express the respective future destinies of the righteous and the wicked. To correctly understand their meaning, therefore, is a matter of very great importance. This ought not to be a difficult task. Nor would it be were it not for the interposition of what are called "theological definitions." There is no difference of opinion among men anywhere concerning the *literal* meaning of the words life and death.

Without attempting a scientific definition of these terms, it will suffice for the present to say, that LIFE means *vital existence*, and that its opposite DEATH means the *extinction of life* or the *cessation of vital existence.*[1] These definitions will be generally accepted as the true meaning of the words life and death when applied to the lower animals, although they are not commonly allowed

[1] The words LIFE and DEATH, with their derivatives, appear to be employed in Scripture to denote the following ideas: LIFE stands for the idea of—

1. *Vital existence*, as distinct from the death or dissolution of vegetable or animal structures; and as opposed to the insensibility of material things. Also, it signifies ETERNAL LIFE.
2. *Activity of movement or agency*; as "living waters;" "the word of God is *quick* [living] and powerful;" "*quicken* thou me in thy way."
3. *Happy existence*; not *happiness* alone, but *happy life*. "In thy favor is life;" "wisdom is a tree of life;" "now I live, if ye stand fast in the Lord."
4. "*To be alive in the Spirit*" is to be living a spiritual life, in opposition to that carnal one of which Paul says, "If ye *live* after the flesh, ye shall die" (Rom. 6: 11), and the "life of God," or godly life. (Eph. 4: 18.)

But LIFE *never* seems to stand for *holiness* alone, or a state of union with God, as is commonly supposed. This appears to be a *purely gratuitous assertion*; on which rests the whole fabric of the opinions which we are venturing to reject. At the same time, it is readily granted that the term *life* is properly *associated* in the case of the righteous with the idea of *holiness*, as it is also with the idea of *happiness: but that it ever loses its proper radical meaning of existence has yet to be proved, and of course the burden of proof lies with the opposite party.*

DEATH, on the other hand, stands for—

1. *The loss or destruction of vegetable or animal life.* "A dead tree;" "a dead lion;" "a dead body."
2. The state of *condemnation to such literal death.* "Thou art but a dead man." (Gen. 20: 7.)
3. *Danger of death.* "Thanks be to God who hath delivered us from so great death." So also "destruction of the flesh," in 1 Cor. 5: 5, is used for a *mortal disease.*
4. To be "*dead to*" anything, signifies *to cease to be or to live in certain relationships to it.* "Dead to the world"—"to sin"—"to the law." But the phrase "dead to God" *never occurs.*
5. To *mortify*, or put to death, signifies to destroy the life of anything, either literally, or in the sense of its *activity and power*; as when it is said "Nabal's heart became *dead* within him."
6. It has never been shown that *death* stands for a state of *misery*, or of *sinfulness, apart from the idea of that literal destruction, or death*, which is the wages of sin.
7. The expression, *spiritual death*, and the distinction between *temporal* and *eternal death*, are alike unknown to the Holy Scriptures. They are, we venture to think, the necessary creations of an erroneous theory.—*Life in Christ*, by the Rev. Edward White.

when spoken of man. But in popular theology man is regarded as an immortal being, and the terms life and death, when applied to him in a future state, are necessarily understood in a figurative sense. Says a distinguished English writer:

"A being who believes he has life already by original creation, in the sense of an unending or immortal existence, is necessitated to understand the promise of life as synonymous with the promise of happiness, and when death is predicated of such a being, it also must be understood in the metaphorical sense of misery, since it is presumed that this native immortality will never be alienated.

"Does not this conversion of the most commonplace terms from their familiar and natural use to a use both unfamiliar and unnatural appear, to say the least, a very singular circumstance? If the language in which the original Scriptures were written could not furnish terms to express the ideas of happiness and misery, then there might be some plausibility for the appropriation of these terms in this arbitrary sense: but the rudest language has its signs for these ideas; and, therefore, there could have been no need, and we should think, too, no reason to set aside the appropriate words, and to employ others in a sense so different from their peculiar signification. Thus employed, the words life and death part with their proper and distinctive signification; and one term especially—the term death—is employed in a sense the very opposite of its original and conventional meaning: *death*, according to the popular theory, is made to signify a *life in misery!*

"Now there are grave objections to this figurative use of the words life and death. In the first place, we have seen they have a very arbitrary and unnatural meaning forced upon them. And in the second place, the conversion of these words from their proper to a very violent and arbitrary meaning has no authority from nor is it demanded by the written word.

"The Bible, professing to be the teacher of mankind in religion, the most interesting and important of subjects, would, of course, not construct a terminology of its own; but make use of the language which the people understood, and employ the terms of such language in their current and conventional meaning; and whenever it was necessary to employ a word different from its customary usage, either the context would make this apparent or there would be some cautionary observation to prevent the possibility of mistake.

"All language is, more or less, figurative; and of all imaginations, the Oriental is the most imaginative; and, therefore, it was to be expected that words would not invariably be used in their strict primary signification: but whenever it should be necessary to employ a word in an unusual sense, there would be ample evidence of its new appropriation. Should there be any danger of misunderstanding the sense in which a word is used, es-

pecially if upon that word depended important doctrine, then we might expect such a cautionary notice of its new meaning, as is furnished, for example, in the book of Revelation (ch. 11: 8), where the great city is called Sodom and Egypt, and we are carefully informed that it is so called 'spiritually.' [See another example in John 7: 38, 39; also, Gal. 3: 23–25.]

"But the words in question have no such admonitory notice, which is the more surprising since such a usage of them, as the Scriptures are alleged to furnish, is contrary to all custom; and being employed to teach very vital doctrines, such an admonition is the more necessary, and to be expected. The fact that the Bible has no inspired glossary or explanation of terms, renders it the more imperative that all its words should be employed according to established usage; and is in itself a tacit proof that such *is* the sense in which every word is used. I conclude, therefore, that the words life and death, as used in the Bible, are to be understood in the same sense they obtain in ordinary language—that is, except when obvious reasons demand a figurative meaning for them—in their plain, literal, conventional signification—not respectively happiness and misery, but existence and non-existence."[1]

It is plain to all that *life* does not necessarily include the idea of *happiness;* since one may possess life and not happiness. The converse of this, however, is not true. If we possess happiness we must necessarily possess life. Life is the necessary foundation of all positive good. To borrow the language of Abp. Whately:

"It is certain that the words life, eternal life, immortality, &c., are always applied to the condition of those, and of those only, who shall at the last day be approved as 'good and faithful servants, who are to enter into the joy of their Lord.' 'Life,' as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean 'happy' life. And that theirs will be a happy life we are indeed plainly taught; but I do not think we are anywhere taught that the word 'life' does of itself necessarily imply happiness. If so indeed, it would be a mere tautology to speak of a 'happy life;' and a contradiction to speak of a 'miserable life,' which we know is not the case, according to the usage of any language. In all ages and countries, 'life,' and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied in ordinary discourse to a wretched life no less properly than to a happy one. Life, therefore, in the received sense of the word, would apply equally to the condition of the blest, and of the condemned, supposing these last to be destined to continue forever living in a state of misery. And yet, to *their* condition the words 'life' and 'immortality' never are applied in Scripture. If therefore we suppose

[1] *Life and Death*, by J. Panton Ham, ch. 2.

the hearers of Jesus and his apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible, in the ordinary sense, the words employed, they must naturally have conceived them to mean (if they were taught nothing to the contrary) that the condemned were really and literally to be 'destroyed,' and cease to exist; not that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness. For they are never spoken of as being kept alive, but as *forfeiting* life: as for instance: 'Ye will not come unto me that ye may *have life*.' 'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath *not* life.' And again, 'perdition,' 'death,' 'destruction,' are employed in numerous passages to express the doom of the condemned. All which expressions would, as I have said, be naturally taken in their usual and obvious sense, if nothing were taught to the contrary."[1]

Hiram Mattison, in a recently published work, says:

"Future *happiness alone* is conditioned upon faith in Christ, and *not our future being*. Consequently, the future non-existence of the wicked cannot follow for lack of a vital connection with Christ, by faith in him. He is 'our life' in that he restores the soul to spiritual life by his Spirit, raises our bodies from the dead, and finally crowns the righteous with glory in heaven. But *our immortal existence is not made dependent upon the reception or rejection of salvation through his name.* We shall exist forever, whether in happiness through faith in Christ and a holy life, or in misery through a life of sin and the rejection of offered mercy through him, the only Savior."[2]

In accordance with this statement of Orthodoxy, is the assertion of a writer in *The Eclectic Review* for August, 1845:

"The term life, when used descriptively of the future state of the righteous, does not denote existence, but happiness exclusively."[3]

Let us proceed at once to try these confident assertions of Orthodoxy, by an appeal to the supreme authority of the Scriptures. Fortunately we have an inspired definition of the term "life," which furnishes the highest and most satisfactory proof, that the Holy Spirit dictated the word in its literal sense:

"He asked *life* of thee, and thou gavest *it* him, *even* LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER." (Ps. 21: 4.)

Here we have one of the most explicit phrases for "immortal existence," used to define 'life' [eternal life], and applied to one

[1] *Scripture Revelations of a Future State*, p. 228.
[2] *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, p. 68.
[3] See Dobney, *Future Punishment*, p. 192.

UMI

who asked it of God. Again we read: "His seed shall endure forever." (Ps. 89: 36.) "With long life will I satisfy him." (Ps. 91: 16.) It may be said that these passages refer to Christ, and that they cannot, therefore, be used as evidence to show the meaning of the word "life" when applied to the future condition of righteous *men*. This anticipated objection, however, would not prove that these passages are impertinent to the question discussed; for Jesus said to his disciples, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14: 19.) And the author of the epistle to the Hebrews says: "Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing that he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (ch. 7: 25.) And again Jesus says, "I give unto my sheep *eternal life*, and they shall never perish." (John 10: 28.) Will the reader be so kind as to carefully notice the absolute conclusiveness of the above passages? The eternal life promised to the faithful follower of Christ is 'LENGTH OF DAYS FOREVER AND EVER.' How brightly the truth shines when contrasted with error!

Notice the significant contrasts in the following passages:

"The thief cometh not, but for to steal and *to kill* and *to destroy;* I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it more abundantly." (John 10: 10.)

"Whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have *everlasting life*." (John 3: 16.)

In these passages, if a metaphorical meaning be placed upon the word 'life,' then the contrasted terms 'destroy' and 'perish' must also be metaphorically explained. But where, it may be asked, is the similitude or resemblance between *destruction* and a *life* of endless misery? Life *may* include happiness; but destruction *cannot* include the idea of endless misery.

If on the other hand we examine the literal meaning of the words 'destroy' and 'perish,' we shall find that they are directly opposed to the idea of the continuance in being of the object to which they are applied. (The only exceptions to this rule are found in "theological definitions.") To destroy means to demolish; to ruin; to bring to naught; to annihilate; to kill; to extirpate; to put an end to. Perish; (literally to depart wholly;) to die; to lose life in any manner; to be destroyed; to come to nothing. The apostle Peter, speaking of the final doom of wicked men, says "they shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." (2 Pet. 2: 12.) The language here used is so forcible that even President Dwight says: "It cannot be denied that the destruction spoken of in this passage is declared to be absolute, and must be either annihilation or eternal wo."[1]

The apostle Paul, in speaking of the wicked at the second coming of Christ, says: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." (2 Thess. 1: 9.) Orthodoxy interprets this passage to mean that the wicked shall be punished with everlasting misery! And when the same apostle says "the wages of sin is *death*," this "tremendous Orthodoxy" says, Not so; for the wages of sin is not literal destruction, but eternal life in torment! This shocking perversion of Scripture is directly traceable to the metaphorical sense invariably given by popular theology to the words 'life' and 'death' when applied to the future state of the righteous and wicked of the human race.

Mr. Mattison has a chapter entitled, "Immortal existence not a result of faith in Christ."[2] This sentiment is endorsed by the leading Protestant Church of America; and not only this Church, but all Orthodox Churches must admit the conclusion, as they accept the premises upon which it is legitimately based. The reader's special attention is invited to the issue thus fairly joined between Orthodoxy and the Bible. What then is the testimony? What saith the faithful Witness?

"If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God, which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son* HATH LIFE; and *he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.*" (John 5: 9-12.)

The phrase "immortal existence" when applied to man means the same as 'eternal life.' The full sense of the passage would be preserved if it were read thus: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us an immortal existence, and this existence is in his Son! He that hath the Son hath an immortal existence; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not an immortal existence."

It is written, "The just shall live by his faith." (Hab. 2: 4.) This text is quoted by the apostle Paul in Rom. 1: 17, and Gal.

[1] *Theology*, vol. 4, p. 460.
[2] *Bible Doctrine of Immortality*, ch. 6.

UMI

3: 11. It is also said, "Without faith it is impossible to please him." (Heb. 11: 6.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (Gal. 3: 25.) "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have *life* through his name." (John 20: 31.) "The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. 6: 23.) "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." (John 3: 36.) These passages conclusively prove that 'eternal life' or immortal existence is a result of faith in Christ.

The same conclusion is reached from considering the distinctive titles given to Christ by the writers of the New Testament. He is called "the Prince of life" (or Author of life, margin) in Acts 3: 15; "Christ, our Life" in Col. 3: 4; and in the Syriac Version, he is frequently called the "Vivifier" and the "Life-giver."[1] There are many passages of Scripture which support his right to those titles. Jesus himself said: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life." (John 10: 27, 28.) "That he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him." (John 17: 2.) "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst: but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life." (John 4: 14; see also Ps. 36: 9.) "To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." (Rev. 2: 7.) Every one of these passages is directly opposed to the notion of man's natural immortality. For it is evident that eternal life is not promised to all men, but to the faithful alone. If all men have an immortal existence guaranteed to them by the deathlessness of their nature, in what sense is Christ called the Life-giver?

The tree of life in Eden was to Adam a pledge of immortality

[1] In the Syraic version of the New Testament the subject of *life* is made more prominent than in the "authorized English version." This will be noticed in the following passages from Prof. Murdock's translation:
Acts 4: 12: "There is not another name under heaven, which is given to men, *whereby to live*."
Acts 5: 31: "Him hath God established as a Head and *Life-giver*."
Rom. 1: 16: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is the power of God *unto life*, to all who believe."
John 12: 47: "I did not come to judge the world, but to *vivify* the world."
Acts 16: 31: "Believe on the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah, *thou will have* LIFE."
Phil. 3: 20: "Our concern is from heaven; and from thence we expect our VIVIFIER, our Lord Jesus Messiah."
Heb. 7: 25: "And he is able to *vivify* forever them who come to God by him."
2 Tim. 1: 10: "The appearing of our *Life-giver*, Jesus the Messiah, who hath abolished death, and hath made manifest life and immortality by the Gospel."
2 Tim. 3: 15: "From thy childhood thou was taught the holy books, which can make thee wise unto *life*, by faith in Jesus the Messiah."
2 Tim. 4: 18: "My Lord will rescue me from every evil work; and will give me *life* in his heavenly kingdom."

so long as he preserved his innocence. It was not the emblem of "happiness exclusively," but of life in its literal sense of continued existence. So, too, the tree of life in the Paradise of God is the symbol of eternal life or immortal existence. But this magnificent inheritance is only promised "to him that overcometh." The result to Adam of being driven out from the tree of life in Eden was not merely unhappiness, but literal death. In carrying out the analogy, therefore, we cannot suppose that those who are to be excluded from the tree of life in Paradise will be immortal.

That Christ is the bestower of life in the literal sense of that term, is further evident from his language in John 5: 21: "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." To this agrees the language of the apostle Paul: "The last Adam was made a quickening [that is, a life-giving] Spirit." (1 Cor. 15: 45.) We cannot in this place substitute the metaphorical sense of the word life, by saying that Christ bestows life on whom he will, in the sense of bestowing happiness only; for the subject of both paragraphs is the resurrection or re-enlivening of dead men, and not the conferring of happiness upon those who were already in possession of eternal life.

Let me now pause to ask, In which of the recorded discourses of our Lord or of his apostles shall we find the unconditional immortality of all men affirmed?

And if for the very best of reasons this question cannot be answered, let me ask, Where have we any Scriptural authority for saying that Christ is the bestower of *happiness*, but not of *life?*

No interpretation will take us through the New Testament without manifest absurdities or obvious contradictions, except that which attaches to the phrase eternal life the meaning of *immortal existence*. In support of this assertion, and as further evidence in favor of the literal sense of the word life, some additional passages from the Gospel of John may be adduced, which appear to be fatal to the popular theory. The most prominent feature in the recorded discourses of our Lord is the promise of EVERLASTING LIFE. The assertion of the apostle in the opening of the chapter is most sigificant. "IN HIM WAS LIFE; and THE LIFE was the light of men." (ch. 1: 4.) This passage evidently denotes that he who is expressly designated as 'THE LIFE' had

UMI

the power to impart life to others. The same meaning is seen in the parallel passage (John 5 : 26): "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here life cannot be taken to mean happiness merely, without destroying the congruous signification of the whole passage. The context would not justify the use of the word 'life' as a metaphor. For in the preceding verses our Lord ascribed to himself the power to raise up and give life to the dead; and in ch. 6 : 53, 54 he says: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day." How plainly do these passages teach that immortality is conditional; and that the expression 'eternal life' is to be taken in its strictly literal sense of immortal existence!

This conclusion is supported by the language of our Lord in ch. 6 : 57, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me." And in ch. 5 : 28, 29 he says: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of *life;* and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Here it is impossible to spiritualize the word 'life' without destroying the sense of the whole passage. The wicked as well as the righteous are to be raised from the graves, but only those who have "done good" shall obtain the "resurrection of life." The frequent reference in the fifth and sixth chapters to the physical ideas of resurrection from "the graves," and to the privilege of living instead of dying, as the fathers in the wilderness died, shows very decisively that the future 'life' promised is intended in a literal and not in a metaphorical sense.

Our Lord said to the Jews: "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." (John 6 : 49–51.) "I will raise him up at the last day." (ch. 6 : 40, 44, 54.) Why is reference made to the resurrection of the dead, if the life spoken of as the result of it means only the happiness of beings already immortal? Were there not words

enough in the Greek language to properly express such a meaning had it been intended? If so, how are we justified in uniformly giving a figurative turn to words which everywhere else are taken in their literal sense?

Will it be said that the life spoken of includes the resurrection of the body, *and* the happiness of the soul already immortal? What then mean these words: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in you?*" (John 6 : 53.) Will our Orthodox opponents say that the WICKED will not be raised to have an eternal existence in the body? An affirmative answer would end the controversy.

When our Lord represents himself as the "bread of life," he plainly intimates thereby that the one great object of his mission was to *give life.* A self-reliant and spiritualistic Orthodoxy confidently asserts that the Lord Jesus is not the source of future life to believers; that all men are to have an immortal existence, let their conduct be what it may; that it is not as the bestower of immortality, but of everlasting happiness, that he styles himself the "Bread of Life." Such a doctrine finds not the slightest support in Scripture, unless it be in Gen. 3 : 4, where the Serpent said to our common mother, "Ye shall not surely die."

The immediate object of the use of bread is to sustain life, not to confer happiness. There are thousands at this very hour who have an abundance of bread, and yet lead a most wretched life. It is not then as the bestower of "happiness exclusively" that Christ is called the Bread of Life, but because the Father has constituted him as the Giver of immortality to all who obey him.

Another very plain instance of the use of the word "life" in its literal sense occurs in the statement of our Lord to Martha, in John 11 : 25, 26: "I am the resurrection and the *life;* he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die."

Now the word 'resurrection' in this passage must of necessity be taken in its literal sense. It would therefore be a violation of all just principles of interpretation to say that the word 'life' in this sentence must be taken figuratively. For it is obvious that in the same sense that Christ is 'the resurrection' he is 'the life.' "I am the resurrection *and the life.*" To take one of these words literally, and to convert the other into a metaphor, would be a perversion of Scripture to serve a theory. Besides, the context exhibits the sense in which the words were used. Our

UMI

Lord teaches that he would raise to life those who had believed in him, but were already dead; while of living believers he asserts they "shall never die;" that is, according to the literal rendering of the Greek, "they shall not die forever." They shall not die in the absolute sense in which the term 'second death' is used, but their death will be a falling asleep in Jesus.[1]

It will not do to spiritualize the words 'life,' and 'he shall live,' 'dead,' and 'shall not die forever;' for there is no question raised either in the text or context about spiritual death and life, nor about happiness and misery.

Once more: in ch. 12: 25, our Lord, in addressing the Greeks who came up to worship at the feast, uses this remarkable language: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

No ingenuity of reasoning can make this passage teach the popular doctrine. It is utterly opposed to the idea that men have eternal life in themselves. For it is plain that a man cannot lose his life and have it at the same time; yet our Lord declares "he that loveth his life *shall* lose it." What is it which a man is here represented as loving? And what is it that he will keep unto life eternal if he hate it in this world? The obvious answer to these questions must carry with it the conviction to every unbiased mind, that Christ is truly the *Life-giver*, in the sense that he gives the pricelesss boon of IMMORTALITY to all who love and obey him.

The great theme upon which Christ and his apostles delighted to dwell was life, *eternal life*. Well did Peter say unto his Lord, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." (John 6: 68.) An inspired apostle has declared that "Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 10.) This revelation was brought about by the personal resurrection of Christ, who afterwards appearing to John in Patmos, says (Rev. 1: 18): "I am he that *liveth* and was dead; and behold I am *alive* for evermore." When we read this sublime utterance, our hearts are cheered with the hope of life, for we remember that precious promise of the Life-giver, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14: 19.) He might just as easily have said, "Because I am happy, ye shall be happy also;" but this would not have been the full or radical idea intended. He and his apostles uniformly use the more comprehensive term "life," without which no other good is possible.

[1] Another exposition makes this promise refer to the living saints at the second coming of Christ. See 1 Thess. 4: 15; 1 Cor. 15: 21.

But it may be asked, Will not the future life of the redeemed be a happy one? Most assuredly it will; but we do not get this idea from the word life itself, but from those passages of Scripture in which the felicity of those who receive the gift of life, is specifically mentioned.

The question at issue is not whether Christ bestows mere existence only, but whether he bestows existence at all. The Orthodox position is, that he is the bestower of happiness *only;* that men are not dependent upon him for future *life*, as they are naturally immortal, and consequently deathless.

The utter absence of any necessity for substituting the word 'happiness' for 'life,' when the latter term is applied to describe the future state of the righteous, is seen from the following language of Scripture:

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. 2: 9.) "In thy presence is FULLNESS OF JOY; at thy right hand are PLEASURES FOR EVERMORE." (Ps. 16: 11.)

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.*" (John 14: 2, 3.) "We shall ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 17.) "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, YE BLESSED *of my Father*, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25: 34.)

"*Blessed* and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." (Rev. 20: 6.)

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, *and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be* NO MORE DEATH, *neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain*, for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21: 3, 4.)

What a magnificent destiny awaits the faithful follower of Christ! To be forever with the Lord; to share in the pure pleasures of the angels; to be forever free from all pain and sorrow; to be assured that perfect peace will never be disturbed by the corroding cares of mortal life—all this will be inexpressibly glorious!

If a righteous man has even in this world, while fully trusting

in God, a "peace which passeth all understanding," what pencil can paint, or pen portray the beatific vision which shall unfold to his enraptured gaze, when admitted to the new heavens and new earth, he beholds the glory of his Redeemer, and is permitted to share in the perpetual pleasures of the Paradise of God? In that bright world, sickness and sorrow, disease and death, will be unknown. There will be no mourners there to weep over the sad ravages of the king of terrors, "for God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be *no more death.*"

This glorious promise made by him whose word is truth, leads to the remark that the Scriptures not only represent Christ as the giver of 'life,' but also as the destroyer of death. Coeval with the entrance of sin into the world was the promise that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head.[1] And the apostle John says:

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (1 John 3: 8.)

The language of the author of the epistle to the Hebrews is still more explicit:

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself took part of the same, that through death he *might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil.*" (ch. 2: 24.)

"He will swallow up *death* in victory." (Is. 25: 8.)

"*The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.*" (1 Cor. 15: 26.)

"And death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." (Rev. 20: 14.)

Only one question remains—What is meant by the expression 'death shall be destroyed?' The 'second death' is, in the Orthodox vocabulary, called "eternal death," and is defined to be "the death that never dies." Hence the expression is spiritualized to read, "the last enemy that shall be endlessly preserved is death." But how contrary would such an interpretation be to reason as well as to revelation! Who does not know that death will never be destroyed so long as he has *living victims* to prey upon? We can never understand what is meant by death being the last enemy that shall be destroyed so long as we define eternal *death* to mean eternal life in misery. When death "is swallowed up in victory," and "*mortality* is swallowed up of LIFE," *then will death be destroyed.* Then "the Most High shall appear upon the seat of judgment, and misery shall pass away, and the long-suffering shall have an end." (2 Esd. 7: 33.)

[1] Literally, "*crush* the serpent's head."

The Orthodox interpretation of the words 'life' and 'death' is an outrage upon human reason, and a reflection upon the character of God. It deprives our glorious Redeemer of the honor of dispensing immortality to his faithful subjects; and disguises under the sentence of death a life of interminable wo.

So long as men feel that they are already immortal, so long will they be unable to realize the great central fact of the Gospel, that Christ is the *Life-giver*, and that he is coming the second time to confer immortality upon all who truly love and obey him.

Why is it that the doctrine of Christ's second advent is so unpopular among modern Christians? Is it not because they fail to realize the great object of his coming? Orthodoxy confidently proclaims that "death is the Prince of peace," and the usher of the happy soul to the realms of glory. It is plain that if Christians believe that they shall go to Christ in heaven when they die, they will not expect him to come to earth again, unless it be in a spiritual manner. Christ said, "I am come that ye might have *life.*" And again, "Ye will not come TO ME that ye might have LIFE." But Orthodoxy only seems to hear that other voice, "Ye shall not surely die;" and turns away with the virtual response: "We already have *life*, IMMORTAL LIFE. We will accept *happiness* at thy hands, but we have all the *life* that we need."

The language of Scripture is, "*When* Christ who is our life shall appear, *then* shall *ye also appear* with him in glory." Our Lord taught his disciples that he would come to *them*, *not* that they should go to him.

The hour is surely coming, nor can it be far distant, when he who is the Resurrection and the Life will come to bestow the priceless pearl of immortality upon all who have sought for it by patient continuance in well doing. (Rom. 2: 6, 7.) Then "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." (Is. 35: 10.)

UMI

THE SIGNS.

THE NIGHT COMETH! Nor does it seem far off. It never appeared so nigh. The shadows are lengthening out, and falling with ominous gloom upon the valleys of earth. The dimness of twilight is beginning to make itself felt. It is settling down drearily upon our cities, and on our solitudes; upon the towers of our strength and the palaces of our pomp: nor can the noisy rush of eager multitudes hurrying to and fro for gain or pleasure wholly stifle the utterance of fear and awe. Men cannot help foreboding evil, for who can tell them what may be in the womb of darkness! The night-birds are already on the wing, flitting around us, and reminding us of the descending night.

Yet it is written also, "The day is at hand!" The night, though dark, is brief, and is soon succeeded by a glorious day. But still of that day the night is the forerunner. And this world's night is surely near. Else, why so many indications of closing day?

But has it not been always thus? Have not other ages as well as the present been equally crowded with signs of trouble? Have not certain men always loved to be prophets of evil, and to interpret gloomily the events of their day? Is there not among many a morbid and unhealthy love of the dark and the ominous?

Be it so. It will not, however, be denied that the time must come when the crisis will arrive; and that before its arrival, it will give notice of its approach by casting its shadows before. If such a crisis remains yet to be realized, then some age or other must be its precursor—must lie next the precipice, and see with its own eyes the gulf below. It is right, no doubt, that we should be cautious, not misdating events, nor miscalculating times, nor misjudging signs; but it is far safer to take swift alarm at what seem like tokens of evil, even though the alarm should prove false, than with incredulous, it may be derisive, skepticism, to reject every sign, and refuse to be forewarned. It is bad, certainly, to be taking needless alarm; but it is incredibly worse to deny that we ought to take alarm at all, as if the day of the Lord would never really come, but was a mere empty name, hung over us for terror, age after age, as a check upon the world and a stimulus to the Church. If, then, that day be a certainty, a reality, who will affirm that, when about to arrive, it will not foreshow itself? Surely a dislike to give heed to the forebodings of judgment must arise from a dislike to entertain even the thought of that crisis. We will not see in the events of the day premonitory shocks of the last earthquake, because we would fain discredit or postpone that day of calamity and terror.

This is not wisdom. Neither is it magnanimity. It is folly; it is littleness of soul. It is a reckless resolution to blind ourselves to the evil as long as possible, and then to brave it, as best we may, when it does burst upon us. Or, there may be the secret thought beneath, "What if it should never come at all? What if we have colored the future with the gloom of our own fancies? What if the world is destined to pass through no such hurricane? What if we are to flow gently on into a fairer region, and a holier era, as winter dissolves itself softly into spring, or as spring expands itself into the brilliance of summer? At least the evil will not come in our day; we need not, then, vainly distract and alarm ourselves before the time."

But how have we discovered that the Lord will not come in our day? How have we ascertained that these signs, on which so many eyes are fixed, are delusive? Has God revealed it to us? Or, are we but guessing? Are we announcing as certain what we merely *wish* to be true? Why should it not come in our time? If it is to come in some age of the world, why not in ours? Who are we that we should affirm concerning our age, that no evil shall come nigh it? Is there a spell upon our generation, that the evil cannot touch it, but must be charmed onward to another? Has the enlightenment of the day reared such an embankment round it that no flood can assail or overflow it? This, surely, is the security of fatalism. It is the dream of unbelief, or the opiate of worldliness, that is resolved to sleep on, unawakened by the unwelcome sound of threatening danger. If it be foolish to be always foreboding evil, it is worse than foolish to be recklessly closing the eye against the tokens of it, however numerously they may crowd upon us.

It may be said that these forebodings have so often been shamed and discredited, that we are justified in giving no heed to them. In every age some have taken the alarm, and have been the prophets of evil that has never arrived. I do not deny this; neither do I wish to hide it. But what of this? Were they not wise men who took the earliest alarm, even though their fears were not realized? They read evil in the signs of the times, and they gave utterance to the feelings of their hearts, that their fellow-men might be aroused. This was not folly, neither was it weakness. It was true wisdom. They painted, perhaps, the signs darker than they really were. They drew more out of them than they were intended to prognosticate. And so, what was dreaded did not come to pass. Yet who will say that they were not truly wise, even though their alarm was premature—far wiser than those who read nothing in those signs at all? Such men have often been derided as gloomy enthusiasts, who sought to cloud the mirth of a happy world, and whose failure was the meet reward for their presumptuous folly. Yet folly was not with them. They might be sad and solemn, but they were not men of gloom or sternness. They had hearts as warm and true as ever throbbed within a human breast. It was

not misanthropy; it was love—love to a heedless world rushing on to judgment unprepared, that drew forth their deep and awful utterances. It was rejected warnings that made them sad, and fain to hide their thoughts within their bosoms, if love would have allowed it, if yearnings over dying multitudes had not constrained them to speak.

Notwithstanding, then, all the objections that are urged against interpreting the signs of the times, I shall, however briefly and imperfectly, make the attempt. Our Lord reproved the Pharisees for *not* doing this; and, having left us so many signs of his coming, will he hold us guiltless if we refuse to consider these, and prepare for his arrival? Those that object to our doing this, would not find fault with us if we would only so interpret the signs as to throw the advent into the distance; that is to say, they admit the propriety of interpreting providential occurrences in some way or other: they cannot, therefore, consistently censure us for *attempting* the interpretation; they can only maintain that our interpretation is faulty and unproved.

The signs which have been given us, both by the Lord and his apostles, are as notable as they are numerous. And it is very evident that those have been selected which were the most expressive and least ambiguous. They are chosen as being the most prominent and explicit that could be given. It cannot be thought that the least striking have been announced, and the most striking concealed. If so, then is it not very remarkable that the millennium is never mentioned as a sign at all? Had this been to take place before the advent, how has it never been alluded to as one of the signs? It would have been by far the most distinct and visible. No one could overlook or mistake it. Yet nowhere, by prophets or apostles, or by the Lord himself, is it noted as a sign. How can this be accounted for, save upon the ground that it was to take place *after*, not *before* the advent? If this be admitted, all is plain; if it be denied, then let those who deny it account for the fact, that among the many signs of the coming the millennium is never mentioned as one. *Why* the most palpable of them all should be omitted, seems to me to require an explanation. On the post-millennial system, the omission seems to me inexplicable; for thus our Lord would be made to profess to tell us the signs of his appearing, and yet to conceal the most notable of them all. But this is not all. The signs which are given are inconsistent with the idea of a millennium before the coming. It is not merely that a certain event is not mentioned, but that those events which are mentioned preclude the possibility of such an event lying concealed among them. Who that reads the Lord's prophecy, which begins with the destruction of Jerusalem, and ends with his appearing in the clouds of heaven, does not feel that the whole drift of it was to show the Church that she was to expect sorrow, not joy, tribulation, not triumph, up till the time when he should return? These signs

were the successive crests of the billows on which she was to be tossed, till he, with his own voice and presence, should rebuke the tempest and calm the ocean. The simple *omission*, then, of the millennium as a sign, is a fact on which we ought to lay much stress; but the omission of it, in circumstances which preclude the possibility of its being a thing reserved or merely unspoken, furnishes a strong argument in favor of a pre-millennial advent.

But without further adverting to this point, let me now note some of the signs which in the present day seem most remarkable as forerunners of the Lord's appearing. And though of some of these it might be said that they have been found in former days, yet others of them, as we shall see, are peculiar to our own.

1. *The diffusion of Infidelity.*—This at least is new. Our fathers knew comparatively little of this, and our fathers' fathers almost nothing. An infidel was rare indeed in their day; a man wondered at and shunned. Towards the close of the last century, infidelity burst forth in France, and partially extended itself elsewhere. Of late years it has developed itself with prodigious swiftness, and assumed a bold and lofty attitude of assault. Its extent is incredible. The masses are thoroughly leavened with it. It has insinuated itself everywhere, and is eating out the very heart of everything like deep principle among men. It has corroded the cement by which society clings together, so that nations and communities are now like walls or towers without mortar, ready to fall to pieces of themselves, or be levelled by the first blast. Its ferocity is alarming; its activity unceasing. Much of it is undisguised and confessed, but very much of it is still secret and unavowed. It taints the air; it blights life; it ossifies conscience; under it, all good things wither. It is the worm at the root of all that is noble and excellent in these last days. Hence the *hollow* condition of things amongst us; the chill that is upon life's warm fellowships and offices of love. Conscience is palsied; the *heart* of the people is gone. Social, political, kindred ties are worm-eaten, and ready to break asunder. The erect bearing and manly vigor which religion imparts is no longer visible. Superstition has come to the rescue, and is trying to supply its place. But in vain. Expediency rules. Large masses of the people are either openly or secretly infidel, if not atheistical. God is not acknowledged. His yoke seems to gall men's shoulders. The nations are ready to cast it off. And what hope is there, what token, that this is to end before the Lord's return to end it?

2. *The increase of immorality.*—Like a flood it is swelling and widening in its course. It is without shame, and without fear. Truth is fast going out of human language; confidence between man and man is leaving human life; friendships are bare and

empty, little more than selfish conveniences; even oaths are frail—in most cases forms, in many, mockeries—

> "And, clad like honesties, the falsehoods move
> Along the world."

Conscience is gone: tenderness of spirit is known only in our works of fiction; noble-mindedness is to be found only on the monuments of the dead. The heart of the nation, nay, of the world, has been tampered with and vitiated, till it is ready for almost any excess of evil: the life-blood is tainted, and hence the loathsome sores that are breaking forth, betokening the depth and virulence of the taint—"the ineradicable taint of sin." Crimes that our fathers knew not of are common among the nations. Licentiousness riots fearfully, perpetrating deeds without a name, so that "it is a shame even to speak of those things that are done of them in secret." Drunkenness staggers along every street. Blasphemy pours itself forth, till we shudder, and close the ear against its horrid sounds. Murder has broken loose, and every day our newspapers are telling some horrid tale of bloodshed; man slaying his fellow-man, in fiendish hatred, or more fiendish love of gain; none spared; the parent butchering his children, the child his parent, the husband the wife, the wife the husband: no sanctity of relationship is any safeguard from the poison, or the bullet, or the knife, or the more brutal hammer. Oh! what a cry is going up to heaven from this land of ours; the cry of innocent blood—blood which a righteous God will yet avenge! But the picture of our spreading immorality is one not easily drawn, save by the record of *facts*—facts which one man scarcely ventures to whisper to another, too awful to be laid bare before the public eye. It calls for a prophet's eye to see it, a prophet's pen to record it, and a prophet's soul to weep over it "in secret places" before the Lord. Men are truly lovers of their ownselves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God." All this is to come to pass in the last days, and to wax worse and worse till the Lord come.

3. *The prevalence of superficialty and formalism in religion.*—Form without power, a body without a soul, religion without vitality; these are among the signs of the last days. The show of piety is widespread, but the thing itself occupies a narrow circle. There is much profession, but profession lies on the surface, and underneath all may be worldliness. Depth and solidity are wanting; the aspect of religion is unhealthy; the fresh hue of primitive times departed; the intense vitality which of right belongs to it, is dried up; so that, instead of its being the living source of motion to the world without, controlling, or counteracting, or impelling its currents, it lies inert and passive, at the

mercy of every outward movement. It is a worldly, self-pleasing religion, adopted for fashion's sake, and used according to convenience. We look in vain for the profound sense of sin, the simple faith which the Church once manifested, the solemn, unearthly walk which she once pursued. We are mere imitators of godliness; we "steal our words one from another." Hence we are driven about with every wind of doctrine, having no stability, no anchorage, save that which the inertness of death affords.

Satan has now transformed himself into an angel of light, and under this fair disguise he is working with marvelous success. He is teaching us to build the tombs of our fathers, that we may rest content with the mere approbation of their principles without any imitation of their practice. He leads some astray into fatal error under the pretext of candor and love of truth; others he saturates with the orthodoxy of the head, that they may become indifferent to their state of heart before God. Some he persuades to deny the Bible; to others he lauds it, that he may make it a substitute for the God of the Bible. He cries up faith, that he may set it as substitute for the object of faith. With some he denies the possibility of assurance, that he may keep them from peace with God; with others he maintains the necessity of it, only in order that he may lead them to make a god of it, and substitute their being sure of salvation for believing in the Savior. He cries down the Arminianism of making works our Savior, that he may lead us into the more subtle delusion of making a Savior of our faith. He allows us a wide range of religious feeling and sentiment, if he can only succeed in making them a substitute for God. He hinders not our being serious, earnest, solemn, if he can thereby feed the cravings of a restless, empty soul with something which may prevent us from seeking the bread of life. He permits us to denounce the world's vanity and hollow pleasures; to be weary of its unsatisfying round of folly, that he may delude us into the idea that this dissatisfaction with the world is a proof that we are religious, and thereby cause us to sit down contented, when yet a great way off from our Father's house. He tolerates the circulation of useful, nay, of religious knowledge, that we may rest satisfied with something short of the fullness of God himself. He may countenance, too, the routine of religious societies or Church courts, and the false excitement of crowded assemblies, eloquent speeches, glowing reports, that he may administer thereby that opiate to the soul by which it may be kept in a delusive day-dream, which seems so like "the sober certainty of waking bliss," that we cannot think of breaking the luxury of the pleasant spell. He inculcates the necessity of providing for our children what is called a liberal education, that he may make that a substitute for a father's blessing and a mother's prayers. He urges the obligation of Christian liberality, the necessity of large funds, that he may

bring men to rest religious enterprise upon funds, not upon faith —upon prudence, not on prayer.

These outward things may be in themselves right and good, but what are they without the indwelling Spirit? What is truth without the True One? What is the perfection of Church order without the vital power from above? The body is there, but the living spirit has fled; the altar and the sacrifice are there, but the fire from heaven descends not; the temple is perfect, and the worshipers are thronging its courts, but the glory is departed; Jehovah has left his shrine!

4. *The strange and incongruous mixture of opinions that prevails.* —Men's imaginations seem to be let loose in every direction in inventing these; science, philosophy, literature, theology, are all shooting forth a rank luxuriance of verdure, which is even already producing a harvest of incongruous opinions. The crudities that are often issuing forth under sanction of these venerable names are such as to make one at times tremble lest truth itself should be drifting from her anchorage. These are the "unclean spirits like frogs, which proceed out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet." They are well said to be "like frogs;" in themselves croaking, contemptible agencies, yet insinuating themselves everywhere, and defiling all places, even the most sacred, with their loathsomeness, and annoying the general ear with their incessant, unmeaning noise. These are they whom Satan is now sending forth, in this the cloudy dusk of the world's declining day, to form a triple alliance between powers hitherto at war with each other, animating them by one spirit to fight against the Lord and his anointed. Of these are the thousand organs of the infidel press, sending abroad its croaking progeny and leavening the nations with the subtle poison of its atheistical politics, and the damnable delusions of its pantheistical theology: from the contamination of whose foul principles (as in Egypt during the plague of frogs) none but God's chosen Israel shall be exempt; for "they shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect." And when is it that these spirits of devils "go forth to the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty?" It is just before the advent. They have been going forth already, and are still going forth: and they shall continue their horrid work of gathering the nations into their great slaughter-house, till the Lord come; for it is added immediately, "Behold, I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments." (Rev. 16: 15.)

5. *Dissociality.*—The coherence of the whole social system is very precarious. Nay, the coherence of its minute component parts, its communities, its neighborhoods, its families, is very slight indeed; if, indeed, it may not be said to be already loosed and dissevered. It is as if our very atmosphere possessed a decomposing power. The cement of society has at length given

way to the corrosive influence of wickedness. Man's native selfishness is in the ascendant. It has burst over its restraints, and is now triumphing. Melancholy triumph for the world! for with it all that is fair and goodly, all that is large-hearted and loving, all that binds us to each other in charity and brotherhood, all that is generous and disinterested, must ere long utterly decay. The world is at length breaking up. Like a stranded vessel over which sea after sea has been driving, it can no longer hold together. Its timbers are parting, and it will soon be a total wreck. God meant the human family to be but one household, knit together in love and brotherhood as well as blood. There has been little enough of this true oneness hitherto; but still there has been some. But now it is disappearing. The family, instead of being like a compact rock, close-knit in all its parts, is fast becoming a mere mound of sand, whose particles have no cohesion, no union, save that of casual, temporary nearness, and whose mass the first springtide will level and sweep away. *Self* is now in full maturity and action. Suspicion of each other is one of the rules of life. It is not possible that the social fabric can cling long together. And who shall *recement* it? Who shall restore the lost unity, and reproduce the vanished confidence? He who comes to make all things new. Things have been allowed to fall into decay, and to continue to crumble down, atom by atom, till he should come, that his should be the glory of remodeling and reconstructing the fallen fabric; and that his might be through eternity the praise, not only of bringing a redeemed Church through death to resurrection-life, and perfection, but of bringing creation through decay and ruin to restitution-life, stability, and comeliness.

6. *Wars and rumors of wars, earthquakes, pestilences, and famines in divers places.*—I need not enter minutely into the proof of the existence of these. The news of every week may bear witness to it. For a while it seemed almost as if the world were at rest, as if its storms had spent themselves. But now all seems changed. Every day brings new indications of disquietude and convulsion. In every region—continent or island, wilderness or fruitful plain—there are wars and rumors of wars, famines, pestilences, earthquakes. Few nations seem willing to draw the sword, yet every nation has her hand upon the hilt; with some it is already gleaming in the air, and with others it is reddened with blood. Over the whole earth is heard "the long, low, distant murmur of dread sound." And is not this the prelude to the last universal war? Is it not a sign of the near approach of him who, when earth's madness and ambition are at their hight—when the summoned nations are gathered at Armageddon, girt for battle and slaughter, himself appears for their discomfiture and ruin? Then, but not till then, wars shall cease, and the weapons of war perish. Then the true Solomon shall begin his reign, hushing the tumults of the nations, and

UMI

introducing the long-expected Sabbath of this weary "work-day world."

7. *The restlessness of the world.*—This sign is in part connected with the preceding, yet may be viewed separately. The state of the world is at present very ominous. "Looking after the things that are coming on the earth" is God's picture of the state of men as the crisis draws on. This certainly seems our attitude at this moment. The earth and the things that are coming on it attract the attention of all. There is something in the state of the world so unsettled, so pregnant with uncertain evil, that every eye is moving to and fro in expectation of strange issues, and as if to catch the first sign of their approach. The form and color of the clouds forebode speedy change, and threaten tempest to the nations. The time for listlessness and apathy is gone. Some thirty years ago, when the skies were bright, and men could promise themselves days of sunshine, it was safe enough to fold the hands and take our ease. But all this is over. No doubt, after the excitement through which we have passed, men would prefer repose. But the onward swell of the waters stays not for an hour. There is among the nations a spirit of restlessness, anarchy, and insubordination; a passionate love of change, a headlong rush to overturn every established system, too furious and united to be ultimately withstood. Many call it but a passing tumult, the frenzy of an hour; but they who understand it know how deep is the spring out of which it flows. The storm, long gathering, but resisted and repressed by the barriers which ancient wisdom had erected for the stability of kingdoms, is concentrating and condensing its strength in these venerable recesses, which may for a while refuse to yield to the explosive force, but which, overstrained at length, give way to the accumulated pressure; the kingdoms of the earth are shivered; throne and temple are overturned; wall and fortress are laid in ruins. Such is the night which is to precede the long-looked-for day, when the whole earth shall arise and put on the garments of beauty, fit and meet for the presence of their glorious King.

8. *Missions.*—No age since that of the apostles has witnessed such wide-spread exertions in behalf of the Jewish and Gentile nations as our own. This, certainly, is a sign peculiar to the present century. I do not defend all that has been done by Missionary and Bible Societies; but still I would point to the fact of hundreds of missionaries going forth to every region of our globe, millions of Bibles circulated, almost every nation having the Scriptures in their own language, and, pointing to these simple but magnificent facts, I ask, Is there not in these a most palpable fulfillment of the words of the Lord, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached to all nations for a witness, and then shall the end come?" In our day we have the universal preaching of the gospel. The result, however, is not the conversion of the world, but the gathering out of the election.

And then "the end" comes! It is not said, and then the millennium comes. But *the end*—the end of the age, the coming of the Son of man. This sign seems also that referred to in Revelation (ch. 14: 6), "I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel, to preach unto them that dwell on the earth." How palpable the sign! It will, I doubt not, become more and more visible—but still, there it is already before us—a sign which foretells a coming Lord, and most distinctly intimates the impossibility of a millennium before his advent.

9. *Disbelief of the approaching advent even in the Church.*—It is no marvel that the world should either deride or deny that event. And it is of the world's mocking that Peter speaks when he says, "There shall come in the last days scoffers, saying, Where is the promise of his coming?" But the Church also loses sight of that day; nay, refuses to credit the news of its approach. She says, "My Lord delayeth his coming." She slumbers and sleeps. And it is just when she is speaking thus, and thus slumbering; it is in an hour when she thinks not, that he arrives. It is often said, Surely, if the time were just at hand, more of God's people would believe it. But it is when many of them are not believing it, and counting on delay, that the Bridegroom comes.

10. *The spread of knowledge.*—Many are running to and fro, and knowledge is increasing. Nor is it knowledge of one kind, but of every kind, secular and sacred. It is, however, for the former that this age is specially distinguished. And Satan is putting forth his utmost resources of power and craft thus to lead men captive at his will. "The prince of all knowledge (as one wrote twenty years ago), where God is not known; of all power, where God is not acknowledged; the bright archangel of the natural man, revealing himself in his angelic glories of natural knowledge, natural beauty, natural wisdom, and natural humanity." Thus does he play his part in this last age! Under these radiant disguises he is bewildering the eyes of men, and persuading them that this diffusion of knowledge is the breaking of the millennial dawn. So specious are his counterfeits, that it is hard to separate the real from the false, the precious from the vile; for when he thus comes forth as an angel of light, clothed in every perfection that the natural heart loves, and the carnal eye admires, who shall penetrate the deception and escape the snare, save those who "know all things," by reason of "the unction from the Holy One?" Most truly (as one has remarked) has the present state of the world been described by one of the world's own poets, when picturing the gay glitter of an evening assembly, over which was thrown

> "A dazzling mass of artificial light,
> Which showed all things, but nothing as they were."

So it is now upon the earth, among the heedless multitudes of

the children of men. It is the world's midnight. They are eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage. Literature, science, art, philosophy, are all their own! Yet there is an artificial coloring, an unreal brightness, over all. There is music, but it is of the syren kind; not the deep melody of old ancestral song. There is eloquence, too, but it is "the words of man's wisdom," not that which speaks for God and "winneth souls." There is fervor, too, but it is the warmth of wild excitement, born in novelty and nursed by perpetual change. There is high thought, too, but it is often of the unhealthful cast, wrought off at the midnight lamp; not the deep musings begot in fellowship with God, and ceaseless converse with that Word which maketh wise the simple.

Along with all this, there is a proud air of independence, like that which said, "Our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?" There is a reckless determination to hold what opinions men please, unchecked and unreproved. And, then, in connection with this, many are loud in maintaining, on the one hand, the harmlessness of error, and on the other, the omnipotence of truth. No doubt, upon unfallen beings, error must fall innocuous, and truth prove itself resistless. But in this fallen world, error cannot be so innocent, nor truth so omnipotent, as some suppose. Were this the native country of truth; were the atmosphere of this world its native air, we might hope to see it spring up in rich and spontaneous luxuriance. But so long as Satan is the god of this world—"the prince of the power of the air"—truth must ever be an alien to the soil. "It bears a bright golden flower, but not in this clime." The sentiment I allude to is one of Satan's most subtle sophistries, by means of which he hopes to succeed in confounding truth and error. "*Magna est veritas et prævalebit*," is the adage of antiquity. I believe it. I know that there is in reserve for truth a glorious triumph in the ages to come, even upon this dark earth; but this shall not be by its own might, but by the Spirit of the Lord. It is not science and philosophy that are to regenerate the world. They are evidences that the predicted time is come when "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." But the "march of intellect" is not the triumph of truth. They are signs of promised day—

> "last in the train of night,
> If better they belong not to the dawn;"

but they are neither the star of morning nor the sun of righteousness. They shall grace the triumph of truth, but not as confederate allies, to whom in part belongs the glory of the victory, but only as captives bound to its chariot wheels. Truth *shall* prevail! but not till he who is TRUTH shall come to lead it on to victory. Then its present obscurity will only enhance its future exaltation. The darkness which now wraps it conceals, but cannot mar it; and, like the face of heaven when the clouds pass

off, which hide, but soil not its spotless azure, it shall emerge unstained.

These are a few of the many "signs of the times." No thoughtful mind will hastily reject them, even though not wholly satisfied; for even though they may appear defective, yet there is much about them that is not improbable; and what if, after all, they should be true? The *facts* to which I have been adverting exist. It becomes us in good earnest to inquire, What do they mean, what do they indicate?

It was the aberrations of one of our exterior planets that gave the first notice to astronomers of the presence of another orb, outside our present planetary region; so it is the strange aberrations, the irregular movements of things around us, that reveal to the well-taught eye of the Church the near approach of that Star which has been so long absent from our system. And as, when the suggestion was given forth to the students of science, many a telescope was forthwith pointed to the quarter where the predicted stranger was expected to present itself, so when the signs of the times proclaim so audibly "The Lord is at hand," should not every eye be turning upward to the heavens from which he is to descend in glory, and every heart throbbing at the thought that he shall so soon be here? How many astronomers are now reproaching themselves, because they were so slow to credit the calculations of science, and be the first to catch a glimpse of the expected planet! And how far more truly, more deeply bitter may be our reproaches hereafter, if we turn coldly away from the announcement, "Behold, he cometh!" and find ourselves shut out from the blessedness of the promise, "I will give him the Morning Star!"

It is now more than three thousand years since God gave to his Church one of her gladdest, richest songs by the mouth of Hannah, in the day when her tribulation was at an end, and the desire of her heart had been given. It is a song of vast prophetic fullness—a song as marvelous in compass as it is magnificent in thought:

> "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust,
> He lifteth the beggar from the dunghill,
> To set them among princes,
> And to make them inherit the throne of glory;
> For the pillars of the earth are the Lord's,
> And he hath set the world upon them.
> He will keep the feet of his saints,
> And the wicked shall be silent in darkness,
> For by strength shall no man prevail.
> The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces;
> Out of heaven shall he thunder upon them.
> Jehovah shall judge the ends of the earth;
> He shall give strength unto his King,
> And exalt the horn of his Anointed."

All this, of course, was full of meaning, even in that early

period in which it was uttered; yet how dim that meaning must have been to those who saw these predicted events only afar off! But like all other prophetic songs, this has gathered fullness as it passed along the ages. Each age has imparted light to it, and dispersed shade after shade. Each generation of the Church has drawn out of it a wider and a profounder meaning. Till now, in this last age, we can take it up and sing it, line after line, with an understanding and an emphasis unknown in earlier days. For the time is at hand, and the projected shadows of the future are becoming every day sharper in their outline, and more intelligible in their motions.

The day is at hand when the poor shall be raised out of the dust, set among princes, and made to inherit the throne of glory; when the Lord shall establish the world upon its pillars, that it may not be moved forever. *Now* he keepeth the feet of his saints, but *then* he shall break their enemies in pieces like a potter's vessel, sending forth his lightnings to scatter them and consign them to the blackness of darkness forever. *Now* the wicked are exalted, but *then* Jehovah shall judge the ends of the earth, giving strength unto his own anointed King, crowning him with the "many crowns," and investing him with glory and dominion forever. What a spectacle shall the new earth then present, when delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the sons of God! Once more meet for God to look upon, and worthy to be the dwelling-place of his eternal Son! Once more linked to heaven by the true ladder of which Jacob saw but the symbol; angels of God ascending and descending, in blessed fellowship and ministries of love! Once more fit to take rank in creation, not, as hitherto, an outcast planet doomed to darkness, but radiant all over with holy beauty, the seat of government and center of influence to the unmeasured universe around.

And how soon shall present night be forgotten in the brightness of the endless day! How soon shall the curse give place to the blessing, barrenness be exchanged for fruitfulness, and all pollution be swept clean away! It is but "a little while" and all shall be well! Another night's tossing on the billows, and then the calm of the eternal morn! One more outburst of the "warring winds," and then all storms are hushed, and the long dissonances of time melt into the one harmony of creation's boundless song!

EDITORIAL.

In presenting The Advent-Christian Quarterly to our patrons, and the public, we may with propriety quote from our published prospectus concerning its design and objects:

The design of this publication is to promote the evolution of truth upon all Bible doctrine; but more especially the following points: Prophecy, fulfilled, fulfilling, and unfulfilled; The second advent of Christ, personal, and at hand; The objects of his advent; His future kingdom, and its inhabitants; The home of the future life; Man: his nature; The intermediate state; Immortality and eternal life—how obtained; The future of the wicked, and related subjects.

The objects of The Quarterly will be, (1) To defend the positions taken on the above topics by the body known as Advent-Christians. (2) To expose the unscriptural position of our opponents, the errors of Immaterialism, and the absurdities of the mystic and spiritualizing systems of interpretation. (3) To furnish reliable expositions of Bible doctrine from the pens of the best writers, among our own and other denominations, upon the subjects indicated.

It is not necessary for us to enlarge on these points. We only ask the prayers of all interested that we may so carry out the purposes indicated as to best subserve the cause of Bible truth, and merit the approbation of that Being without whose approval all other commendation would be worthless.

The opening article of our first number is, very appropriately, from the pen of Eld. Joshua V. Himes, the first publisher of an Advent periodical in this country. When in 1839 William Miller was about to quit the field as a lecturer upon prophecy, quite discouraged, if not disheartened, he providentially made the acquaintance of Eld. Himes, who, after hearing and examining his views, became convinced that they were in the main, at least, correct; and with faith in their truth came also the conviction that they should be published more widely than they could be simply by one traveling preacher and his book. Conviction was speedily followed by action. Conferences were called, periodicals established, books and tracts multiplied, and the Advent movement was fairly inaugurated.

It is not our purpose to here sketch the principles or progress of Adventism. We simply remark, that as a leader in this movement Eld. Himes has met the fate of all leaders, in having his motives assailed and his actions misconstrued. Especially has this been the case in respect to his relations to the so-called Life and Death question. But he has left cavilers without an excuse by his frank and interesting exposition of his experience on the Life and Death question. While many of his coadjutors have become conservative, he has been growing more radical with age.

UMI

Truth and Love is from the pen of a London clergyman, the Rev. Samuel Minton. Mr. Minton has brought upon himself no little persecution by his trenchant preaching and writing against the dogmas of the immortality of the soul and the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. We have more excellent articles from his pen for our readers.

Churchianity vs. Christianity is the apt title of a searching though fair criticism of popular religion by Eld. A. A. Phelps, of Rochester, N. Y. Eld. Phelps was formerly connected with the body called Free Methodists—a misnomer; no body of Methodists is more sectarian—who withdrew their fellowship on his profession of belief in the extinction of evil. Our readers will second our request for Eld. Phelps to become a frequent contributor to our pages.

In his masterly examination of *Paul's "Desire to Depart,"* Br. Thomas Davidson, of Quebec, P. Q., clears away the fog with which immaterialism has beclouded Pauline theology, and relieves the Apostle of the imputations of inconsistency in teaching to which the popular immaterialist view renders him liable.

Eld. L. C. Collins, of Monticello, Minn., in an article on *The Kingdom of God*, gives new interest to an old subject. There is a peculiar charm in his style which ever gives a new zest to "old truths."

Eld. Collins is a contribution to the Advent cause from the Methodist Episcopal Church, for which we heartily thank them. He was expelled from the Minnesota Conference because of his belief that the finally impenitent will literally perish, or become extinct at the judgment. He was thus forced to speak out upon the views which previously had been almost, or quite, a private opinion. Some ten thousand of his tracts, *Address to the Minnesota Conference* and *Objections Removed*, have been circulated. Our hope is that the M. E. Church will ever be zealous in expelling *such* heretics.

Life and Death is the Scriptural title of an able contribution from the pen of James H. Whitmore, of Ypsilanti, Mich. The article is a chapter from a forthcoming work, to be issued by the W. A. C. P. Association during the coming fall. The most careless reader will observe the clearness and force of Mr. Whitmore's reasoning, his powers of analysis, and his fairness in the presentation and consideration of objections. His work will be one of the most valuable contributions yet made to Advent-Christian literature, and will command the attention and respect of our most bigoted opponents.

The selection on *The Signs of the Times* is from the writings of the Rev. Horatius Bonar, editor of *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*. It is the able utterance of candid yet thoroughly earnest conviction.

We are very grateful for the kind reception our proposition for an Advent quarterly magazine has met with; and are happy to assure our readers that by prompt subscriptions, all doubt of its continued existence is removed. It is settled that The Quarterly is to be a permanent addition to Advent literature. We are anxious however to introduce some improvements; and chiefly we desire to make an addition of twenty pages in the second number, giving one hundred pages of reading matter instead of

eighty. The requisite to this desired end is *an enlarged subscription list*. Let every subscriber procure another, and the improvements, including the enlargement, will be secured. Who will help?

The Editor will in no case be responsible for the sentiments of correspondents. We have no desire to make The Quarterly merely a reflex of our own personal ideas and opinions, as must be the case if we assume the responsibility of the sentiment of all we publish. We shall aim to present articles from able and judicious minds, and the mere fact that they may differ in opinion with us, or others, does not prove them wrong, or unworthy of a hearing. Differences of opinion lead to investigation; and to stimulate investigation is one great object of The Quarterly. Not that we intend to make it an organ for the introduction of schism and distraction. We think we understand the distinction between *liberty* and *license*. The former means life and healthful growth in the body. The latter means divisions and death.

Let every number of The Quarterly be made useful. Keep it in sight. Let it lie on your table so exposed that visitors will see it. If they become interested, lend it to them, urging them to read it, and to return it promptly, that others may have the same opportunity. Don't allow it to be lost, or destroyed, or be laid away out of sight to serve as a dust accumulator; let it preach somewhere, if it is only by keeping it in sight.

One of the most interesting documents issued of late on the question of the duration of evil is an article from the pen of Dr. Charles K. True, of Massachusetts, which appeared in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1869. The article is a brief review of Charles Beecher's theodicy, as set forth in his work, *Redeemer and Redeemed*. He gives a concise, fair, and exceedingly interesting statement of Mr. Beecher's position, and then indulges in some intimations of his own views of this question, which if a past precedent be carried out indicate another expulsion for "heresy" from the Methodist Church. Certainly Eld. Collins' "heresy" was not more clearly defined than is Dr. True's in this article. The Doctor's remarks on *punishment* are so just and forcible, and his statement of the various theodicies now claiming attention are so clear, that we quote them for the consideration of our readers:

"It remains to consider the nature of the penalty which is attached to sin in the law. Theologians seem not to be conscious that it is here the real difficulty lies in the vindication of the Divine government. We can reconcile with our ideas of the justice and goodness of God the origin of sin, the depravity of our fallen race, and the atonement, on the supposition that accountable beings are not, in the trial of their virtue, put to the risk of too great consequences in case of failure. The plea that they are free, and if they know their doom, whatever it may be, they are to blame for incurring it, is not satisfactory. They should not be allowed to take such responsibility. Besides, the guilty are not the only ones affected by their doom; their friends, the angels of God, all sympathetic creatures, and God himself, are concerned in.

Truth and Love is from the pen of a London clergyman, the Rev. Samuel Minton. Mr. Minton has brought upon himself no little persecution by his trenchant preaching and writing against the dogmas of the immortality of the soul and the eternal conscious suffering of the lost. We have more excellent articles from his pen for our readers.

Churchianity vs. Christianity is the apt title of a searching though fair criticism of popular religion by Eld. A. A. Phelps, of Rochester, N. Y. Eld. Phelps was formerly connected with the body called Free Methodists—a misnomer; no body of Methodists is more sectarian—who withdrew their fellowship on his profession of belief in the extinction of evil. Our readers will second our request for Eld. Phelps to become a frequent contributor to our pages.

In his masterly examination of *Paul's "Desire to Depart,"* Br. Thomas Davidson, of Quebec, P. Q., clears away the fog with which immaterialism has beclouded Pauline theology, and relieves the Apostle of the imputations of inconsistency in teaching to which the popular immaterialist view renders him liable.

Eld. L. C. Collins, of Monticello, Minn., in an article on *The Kingdom of God*, gives new interest to an old subject. There is a peculiar charm in his style which ever gives a new zest to "old truths."

Eld. Collins is a contribution to the Advent cause from the Methodist Episcopal Church, for which we heartily thank them. He was expelled from the Minnesota Conference because of his belief that the finally impenitent will literally perish, or become extinct at the judgment. He was thus forced to speak out upon the views which previously had been almost, or quite, a private opinion. Some ten thousand of his tracts, *Address to the Minnesota Conference* and *Objections Removed*, have been circulated. Our hope is that the M. E. Church will ever be zealous in expelling *such* heretics.

Life and Death is the Scriptural title of an able contribution from the pen of James H. Whitmore, of Ypsilanti, Mich. The article is a chapter from a forthcoming work, to be issued by the W. A. C. P. Association during the coming fall. The most careless reader will observe the clearness and force of Mr. Whitmore's reasoning, his powers of analysis, and his fairness in the presentation and consideration of objections. His work will be one of the most valuable contributions yet made to Advent-Christian literature, and will command the attention and respect of our most bigoted opponents.

The selection on *The Signs of the Times* is from the writings of the Rev. Horatius Bonar, editor of *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*. It is the able utterance of candid yet thoroughly earnest conviction.

We are very grateful for the kind reception our proposition for an Advent quarterly magazine has met with; and are happy to assure our readers that by prompt subscriptions, all doubt of its continued existence is removed. It is settled that The Quarterly is to be a permanent addition to Advent literature. We are anxious however to introduce some improvements; and chiefly we desire to make an addition of twenty pages in the second number, giving one hundred pages of reading matter instead of

eighty. The requisite to this desired end is *an enlarged subscription list.* Let every subscriber procure another, and the improvements, including the enlargement, will be secured. Who will help?

The Editor will in no case be responsible for the sentiments of correspondents. We have no desire to make The Quarterly merely a reflex of our own personal ideas and opinions, as must be the case if we assume the responsibility of the sentiment of all we publish. We shall aim to present articles from able and judicious minds, and the mere fact that they may differ in opinion with us, or others, does not prove them wrong, or unworthy of a hearing. Differences of opinion lead to investigation; and to stimulate investigation is one great object of The Quarterly. Not that we intend to make it an organ for the introduction of schism and distraction. We think we understand the distinction between *liberty* and *license*. The former means life and healthful growth in the body. The latter means divisions and death.

Let every number of The Quarterly be made useful. Keep it in sight. Let it lie on your table so exposed that visitors will see it. If they become interested, lend it to them, urging them to read it, and to return it promptly, that others may have the same opportunity. Don't allow it to be lost, or destroyed, or be laid away out of sight to serve as a dust accumulator; let it preach somewhere, if it is only by keeping it in sight.

One of the most interesting documents issued of late on the question of the duration of evil is an article from the pen of Dr. Charles K. True, of Massachusetts, which appeared in *The Methodist Quarterly Review* for April, 1869. The article is a brief review of Charles Beecher's theodicy, as set forth in his work, *Redeemer and Redeemed*. He gives a concise, fair, and exceedingly interesting statement of Mr. Beecher's position, and then indulges in some intimations of his own views of this question, which if a past precedent be carried out indicate another expulsion for "heresy" from the Methodist Church. Certainly Eld. Collins' "heresy" was not more clearly defined than is Dr. True's in this article. The Doctor's remarks on *punishment* are so just and forcible, and his statement of the various theodicies now claiming attention are so clear, that we quote them for the consideration of our readers:

"It remains to consider the nature of the penalty which is attached to sin in the law. Theologians seem not to be conscious that it is here the real difficulty lies in the vindication of the Divine government. We can reconcile with our ideas of the justice and goodness of God the origin of sin, the depravity of our fallen race, and the atonement, on the supposition that accountable beings are not, in the trial of their virtue, put to the risk of too great consequences in case of failure. The plea that they are free, and if they know their doom, whatever it may be, they are to blame for incurring it, is not satisfactory. They should not be allowed to take such responsibility. Besides, the guilty are not the only ones affected by their doom; their friends, the angels of God, all sympathetic creatures, and God himself, are concerned in

their sufferings. Yet on this superficial plea theologians have, to alarm the wicked, piled up horror upon horror, lasting unrespited through eternal ages, not considering in what an odious light it places the character of the Creator, nor whether such exaggerations are not likely to stagger all faith in revelation. Indeed, most of the infidelity of Christendom can be traced to the revulsion which kind and considerate minds have experienced on this subject. It is time for the Christian world to wake up to the effect of such dogmas if they would not have evangelical religion completely wrecked upon these sand-bars. It is not our purpose to define the scriptural doctrine of future punishment; perhaps in its nature, if not in its duration, it is left in obscurity and mystery. Our point is, that it behooves us not to accept any doctrine which reflects upon the Divine justice and goodness. This is indeed the very first principle of correct interpretation. The following schemes for eternal punishment are now pressed upon our attention:

"1. Mr. Beecher's view of the doom of sinners is, that it depends for its continuance upon the continued impenitence of the condemned. At any moment when they will submit to God and ask for mercy they will receive it; but then he believes that they never will submit. This is the view taken by the author of *Ecce Deus* (and by Bledsoe in his *Theodicy*), who displays equal ability with our author in treating of this perplexing topic, subject, however, to one drawback in respect to his absurd and almost blasphemous remarks upon the impossibility of the Almighty's annihilating moral beings.

"2. There is the doctrine of Dr. Bushnell, that sinners receive a certain measure of sorrow at their doom; but their being may grow less and less without ever reaching a complete extinction, as the asymptote of a circle is a line so projected as to be always approaching the circle without ever touching it.

"3. The doctrine that the penalty-state is exile from heaven forever, in a depraved character and under eternal despair of any improvement, but not increasing in sin or in misery by any proclivity derived from a state of probation, but subject to such alternations as may arise from keeping or breaking the rules of prison discipline.

"4. The opinion that by the law of habit sinners will grow more and more wicked, and consequently more and more miserable forever.

"5. The doctrine that in addition to the pangs of a guilty conscience and disappointment of heaven the wicked will be positively and ceaselessly tormented by burning unconsumed in actual fire, or its equivalent in the power to torture.

"6. The doctrine that fire is but the symbol of swift and painful destruction, and that the eternal doom of the wicked is literal death at the day of judgment; that is, the extinction of consciousness and all capacity of thinking, or feeling, or acting. This ends, of course, the terrible scene of sin and suffering by the destruction of the subject.

"7. The human soul is material or inseparable from the body—and perishes with the body at death; a destiny which will be reversed only in the case of the righteous by resurrection at the final coming of Christ.

"8. The resurrection of the wicked at the last day to receive a public judgment and the doom of utter annihilation.

"9. Transformation, or moral death, by the elimination of the moral attributes of wicked men and the oblivion of memory; the abuse of man's moral capacity ending in its destruction, and degrading him, like Nebuchadnezzar, to the level of the beasts of the field.

"All these theories agree as to the eternal loss of heaven as being the main element in the doom of the lost. To the inquiring mind, reconsidering the question *de novo*, the problem would be to determine which theory is most agreeable to the Scriptures and to rational considerations, and especially the justice and wisdom of God and the moral order and peace of the universe. With some of them a rational vindication of the divine government is easy; but with others no theodicy is possible, whatever views may be taken of the origin of sin, of depravity, and probation."

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—OCTOBER, 1869.—NO. II.

THE COMFORTING HOPE.

BY ELD. O. R. FASSETT, Minneapolis, Minn.

"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." (1 Thess. 4: 13, 14.)

"There is upon many of us a fear of death, and yet surely we may not be afraid of sleep. Never more will these sleepers lift tired hands, and wipe away hot tears. Night is the time for rest; and that unbroken sleep—how much it will do for the bodies which are sown corruptible, and reaped in incorruption."—*Mary Anne Farningham.*

"Tired nature's sweet restorer, balmy sleep."
* * * * * * * * *
"Yet that were vain, if dreams infest the grave."—*Young.*

The Gospel affords comforting and consoling hope to Christian believers, when bereaved of their near and dear Christian friends, or kindred, who have "fallen asleep in Jesus." And the Apostle would not have believers "*ignorant*" of the comforting "*hope*," amid the sorrows of the present, their own mortality, and that of those who have thus fallen under the dominion of the grave.

The resurrection from the dead of our Lord and Redeemer forms the sure foundation and basis of "that blessed hope" "concerning them which are asleep."

"As Jesus died and rose again
Victorious from the dead;
So his disciples rise and reign
With their triumphant Head."

A careful analysis of the text, and especially of the explana-

tory passage (v. 14), is necessary to a right apprehension of the gospel hope.

"*Will God bring with him.*" The Apostle explains this sentence in his other epistles. He says: "The God of peace brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus," etc. (Heb. 13: 20.) And again: "Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up *us* also *by* Jesus." (2 Cor. 4: 14.) We therefore conclude with him: "Even so, them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring ["again from the dead," as he "brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus"] *with him*," or "*by Jesus.*" Hence he proceeds to affirm: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." (v. 16–18.) Thus the Apostle makes plain [1] from *whence* he will "*bring*" the sleepers; [2] by whom "God" will raise the dead; and [3] the *time* when the work shall be accomplished.

Landis, in his review of Prof. Bush on this passage, gives the following just criticism:

"His theory makes the dead saint not sleeping, but awaking; and this he expresses in so many words in remarking on Ps. 17: 15—'I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.' This awaking, says he, is the entrance upon the resurrection state at death. When the believer is raised from the dead, he is therefore neither *dead* nor asleep; but truly and properly *awake.* How, then, can all these saints of whom Paul speaks be *asleep* when Christ comes, when, according to the Professor, they are *awake* and already raised from the dead? These remarks will enable the reader fully to appreciate the following labored criticism of Prof. Bush, in which he gives one of the most ludicrous perversions of language that I have lately met with. After making the following observation, 'But here an objection would at once occur: How can they come with him, unless previously they were with him?' he says: 'This natural query the apostle proceeds to obviate in the sentence as follows: "The dead in Christ [*i. e.*, those that have slept in him] shall rise first;" *i. e.*, shall rise, or shall have arisen, previously.... The evidence, therefore, may be considered strong, that this is the true sense of the term in this connection, and the clause, being thrown in for the purpose of meeting a tacit objection, ought to have been enclosed in a parenthesis. The whole passage will then read thus: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God (and the dead in Christ shall have previously arisen); then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds [*i. e.*, in multitudes], to meet the Lord in the air." The phrase "shall be caught up together with them" means not in this view so properly that *we shall be caught up when they were already descending with Christ from heaven*; but simply, we shall be caught up to be with them.'"

Mr. Landis well says, this is "a huge display of criticism and learning;" and adds:

"And yet upon the foregoing poor misconstruction of the passage our author builds his astounding criticism. He does not, however, venture to explain how the risen saints are *both asleep and awake* (as his theory makes them) at one and the same time. The Professor makes the question to be, 'With what bodies do the *dead* come down from heaven?' It is strange that even the wording of this did not show him its absurdity, according to his theory. For according to the Professor, when *the dead come down from heaven, they are not dead,* any more than we are, and not as much; for they have been '*raised from the dead,*' he says, and to call them *dead,* therefore, is preposterous."

While Mr. Landis thus severely, and we must say justly, criticises and censures Prof. Bush's absurd interpretation of this passage, we see no material difference between the Professor's view and that, taking the Church at large, generally held as the popular faith respecting its teaching. For it is maintained that the sentence, "Them which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him," refers to the *souls* of the departed dead, which it is claimed do not die; and that they accompany our Lord to the earth, "at the last day," to resume their bodies. If so, then the souls are *asleep* as they descend from heaven! As inquired a good brother of a clergyman who was endeavoring to give the profound interpretation, that "Christ would bring the souls with him to put into the bodies of his saints," "Are the souls *asleep,* brother?" to which he could give no consistent reply. However, with a right understanding of the text, as explained by the Apostle himself, as we have given, all is plain; and may we not exclaim with Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead!"

UMI

(1 Pet. 1 : 3.) And do we not see the force of Paul's reasoning: "If Christ be not raised," "and the dead rise not," "then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." (1 Cor. 15 : 12–18.) And hence we must conclude with him, that as to any hope of future existence beyond this life, not dependent upon the resurrection from the dead, as conjectured by some of the heathen philosophers, it is not worth a thought; nor does it constitute any part of the gospel hope as set forth by him, or any other of the sacred writers.

The Christian world at large have involved this "blessed hope," "the resurrection," in great obscurity: and almost lost sight of it by substituting another; and that is, of "dying and going to heaven;" or "going to heaven at death." The sacred Scriptures speak of the departed dead as having "fallen asleep"—"which are asleep"—"Lazarus sleepeth"—"David fell on sleep"—"the sleepers in the dust of the earth"—"we shall not all sleep," etc., etc. And this is the uniform Scriptural phraseology concerning the state of the dead. But a modern divine, or Christian writer, or speaker, would not content himself with this language so unmeaning, to his notion, and so inconsistent with his theology learned at the schools; but the language chosen is, the dead are "gone to heaven"—"they are in glory"—"they have entered into reward"—and "are in the regions of the blessed"—"in the spirit land."

Who cannot perceive the difference between the Scriptural and primitive language used respecting "the dead in Christ," and the more modern phraseology? and that this difference is expressive of a wide diversity of ideas concerning the departed dead? The sacred writers view the dead as "sleepers in the dust," awaiting the awakening "at the last day." Modern theologians and writers look upon them as those neither *dead* nor *asleep* in "the dust of the earth," but both *alive* and *awake*, and virtually needing no resurrection from the dead, or awakening.

To support and confirm this idea and hope respecting "the dead in Christ," certain texts of the Scriptures are disjointed, and wrested, and perverted from their connection, and a meaning put upon them never intended by the sacred writers or speakers; as, for instance, Luke 23 : 43. This is invariably quoted without its context, v. 42. It is Christ's language to the penitent thief: "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." I have heard, however, of a single exception to the above

remark: of a clergyman who said: "It is true that the penitent thief prayed, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom!' but the Lord immediately corrected him, and told him that he need not wait until then—Even 'to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise!'" Half the truth is by this exposition now confessed; and that is, that the thief prayed understandingly and Scripturally (Dan. 7 : 13, 14; 2 Tim. 4 : 1); and I think the other will have to be when our translators are willing to transfer the comma after the word "thee," and put it, where it belongs, after "to-day;" thus: "Verily I say unto thee to-day,—Thou shalt be with me in Paradise:" which would be a consistent reply to the petitioner's prayer, and agreeable to the teachings of the Scriptures as to the period of rewards. And why not do this, as well as to have changed within a dozen years, as all Bible Societies have done, the comma after the word "regeneration," and put it after the pronoun "me," in Matt. 19 : 28? So that the passage now reads far differently, and more consistently with a true theolgy: "Ye who have followed me,—in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory," etc. We demand the same change in punctuation of Luke 23 : 43, in the name of a true and unperverted Scriptural theology.

Phil. 1 : 22, 23 is interpreted so as to make Paul contradict himself in his own writings, and so confuse the mind as to lose sight of his only "blessed hope," and "earnest expectation." "*To die is gain.*" This is made to refer to the advantage of the believer in the condition of death; making death a blessing instead of a curse or penalty of violated law! And Paul's inquiry, "What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?" is wholly inconsistent, as well as his language, "If Christ be not raised"—"if the dead rise not at all"—"then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are *perished*." "Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." (1 Cor. 15 : 18–32.)

"*Having a desire to depart* and be with Christ," is interpreted to make Paul again contradict himself when he says of the intermediate state: "*Not* for that we would be unclothed." In the one place *desiring* the condition "far better," in the other *not desiring* it at all!! How much better this classification: "Earnestly desiring to be clothed upon—that mortality might be swallowed up of life." (2 Cor. 5 : 2, 4; 1 Cor. 15 : 51, 54.) "Earnest expectation and my hope—having a desire to depart and be

with Christ; which is far better." (Phil. 1:20 23. Compare 1 Thess. 4:16, 17.) "Far better" than what? A condition of "life" or "death," or a state of mortality (Phil. 1:20), between which to "choose I wot not." (v. 22.) There are three conditions of which he speaks: "life," "death," and being "with Christ"—not in an "unclothed" condition, as the heathen and Spiritists conceive; but in glorified person. And this was his "earnest expectation and hope." (v. 20.) He was determined while he lived "Christ" should "be magnified" in his "body" by his "life;" and in the event of his death, that it should be "*gain*" and "advantage" also to Christ, as his martyr death has been.

2 Cor. 5:1–10 is interpreted so as to make "the undying soul" enter into a new "*house*," or "*body*," at death; and so blurs the conception of the glorious hope of the resurrection of "the vile" or humbled "body" into the likeness of the glorified body of our risen Lord. (Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor., ch. 15.) And there is an endeavor to make it appear, that as to the "*identity* of the resurrected body, it is not a question of much practical value."[1]

Of course! What does the soul want of two "houses" in which to live, or two "bodies" when, too, it is maintained that bodies are "clogs" to the soul? And in the event of the resurrection of the *identical* body from "the dust of the earth" (Dan. 12:1–3), and from the "grave" (John, ch. 5), what is the soul to do with the body or house it entered at death? Will death be needful to divest it of that body in order to resume the old habitation made new? Or with these difficulties in this new theology, shall we not abandon altogether the doctrine of the resurrection from the dead? as some have done.

The following is the profound interpretation given in *The Sunday-school Instructor* for April, 1869, of 2 Cor., ch. 5:

"The soul lives in the body as we—our bodies and souls—live in a house or tent. It looks out of our eyes, which are the windows. It hears through our ears, and speaks by our tongues. Our bodies change, or must be laid away; therefore we should not love them too much. By and by our soul will leave the body. It will die, decay, and pass away, as have those of our friends, parents, brothers, or sisters....After death he will give us a glorious covering for our souls, a body fit to be in heaven, made by God....When the spirit of a little believing child leaves its body it will go to be with Jesus....In heaven we shall see him as he is, and be like him."

[1] *The National Sunday-school Teacher*, March, 1869.

Can there be considered a greater perversion of truth, or the meaning of the Scriptures than this? The regard that we should have for our bodies (1 Cor. 6:14, 15, 19, 20); the hope of the resurrection from the dead at the last day (1 Cor., ch. 15; John, ch. 6); the glorious restitution, and regenesis of our globe as the final happy abode of the just (Acts 3:21; Rom., ch. 8; 2 Pet., ch. 3; Rev., ch. 21); and the coming of our Redeemer, when we shall "see him as he is" (1 John 3:1–3); these are wholly ignored by such an interpretation of this Scripture!

The apostle does not say that "if our earthly houses of these tabernacles were dissolved, we have buildings of God, houses not made with hands," etc., which he would have said, substituting the plural for the singular, if he had been teaching the doctrine of these modern divines!

His subject matter began in the verse preceding (ch. 4:18), where he declares that the "things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal;" and thus contrasts the present with the future world and state beyond the final dissolution at the last day. Hence he adds: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved"—i. e., "things seen." "Seeing then that all these *things* shall be dissolved"—"the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat"—"the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burned up." (2 Pet. 3:10–12.)

"We have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." What building and house is this, which the fires will not reach, or dissolve? Ans.—"Abraham looked for a city—whose *builder* and *maker* is *God*." (Heb. 11:10.) And Jesus says: "In my Father's *house* are many mansions." (John 14:2.) And Paul says in another epistle: "Jerusalem which is above is free," etc. (Gal. 4:26.) And John hears the angel declaring it to be the "New Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God." (Rev. 3:12.) And it is found finally in connection with the "new heavens and a new earth." (Rev., ch. 21.) If our modern theologians should let the Scriptures explain themselves, and be their own infallible interpreter, they would fall into fewer absurdities.

Tradition has added to the Scriptural doctrine of the resurrection and restitution that of the heathen philosophy of "the soul's immortality," and consequent rewards in death in remote

regions in the universe. This did the Jewish Church prior to the first advent of the Messiah. Says Gibbon:

"We might naturally suppose that a principle so essential to religion would have been revealed in the clearest terms to the chosen people of Palestine, and that it might safely have been entrusted to the hereditary priesthood of Aaron. It is incumbent on us to adore the mysterious dispensation of Providence when we discover that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is omitted in the law of Moses.

"To the authority of Scripture, the Pharisees added that of tradition, several speculative tenets from the philosophy or religion of the Eastern nations; and as the Pharisees, by their austerity of manners, had drawn into their party the body of the Jewish people, *the immortality of the soul* became the prevailing sentiment of the synagogue under the Asmonæan Princes and pontiffs." (vol. 1, p. 530–31.)

"This doctrine sprang from Greek philosophy. The ancient Hebrew writings contain no trace of it. Some Jews embraced the Hellenic culture, not to speak of the Jewish school of Egypt, in which attempts to amalgamate Hellenism and Judaism had been continued for nearly 200 years. Josephus furnishes us with a Jew completely Hellenized." (M. Renan, *Life of Jesus*, p. 74.)

The Christian Church, during the days of the apostasy, and the reign and supremacy of that corrupt form of Christianity, which became paganized—the Romish Church, also, incorporated the heathen doctrine of the soul's immortality into the faith of the gospel.

"The doctrine of the immortality of the soul was first tolerated in the Christian Church in the fifth century, being advocated by that remarkable man Synesius, who was bred in the Platonic school." (Hudson.)

Wm. Tyndall thus sharply rebukes the Papists of his day:

"Ye in putting departed souls in heaven, hell, and purgatory, destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good a case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of a resurrection? The true faith putteth the resurrection, which we are warned to look for every hour. The heathen philosophers denying this, did put that the soul did ever live; and the Pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ with the fleshly doctrine of philosophers together—things so contrary they cannot agree."

Thus we see that the doctrine of the soul's immortality, and a state of conscious rewards in death, is plainly an innovation on

the faith once delivered to the saints, being the incorporation of the heathen philosophy of a future state into the Christian system.

The doctrine of the resurrection from the dead is the doctrine of divine revelation, and constitutes the only sure hope concerning a future life. The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not a doctrine taught by the inspired writers; but was one conjectured and guessed at, and taught by heathen philosophers, groping their way without divine revelation, and no light concerning a future state; and which they themselves hardly believed, and never could demonstrate either to their own satisfaction, or to the judgment of mankind, as there is abundant evidence to show.

"A doctrine thus removed beyond the senses, and the experience of mankind, might serve to amuse the leisure of a philosophic mind; or in the silence of solitude, it might sometimes impart a ray of comfort to desponding virtue: but the faint impression which had been received in the schools was soon obliterated by the commerce and business of active life. We are sufficiently acquainted with the eminent persons who flourished in the age of Cicero, and of the Cæsars, with their actions, their characters, and their motives, to be assured that their conduct in this life was never regulated by any serious conviction of the rewards or punishments of a future state. At the bar, and in the Senate of Rome, the ablest orators were not apprehensive of giving offence to their hearers, by exposing that doctrine as an idle and extravagant opinion, which was rejected with contempt by every man of a liberal education and understanding." (Gibbon, vol. 1, p. 528.)

Enlightened Christian believers, with the "lively oracles" in their possession, should not be "ignorant" of the divine purposes and promises respecting a future life; and they are not; and hence concerning "them which sleep in Jesus," they "sorrow not as others which have no hope."

I. *They do not sorrow as those who regard death as a state of eternal oblivion.*

The ancients invented the fabled "Fountain of Lethe," or oblivion: and Virgil in gloomy verse describes the naked and miserable ghosts driven to that fabled river, there to drink eternal forgetfulness. These heathen were so violent in their grief as to injure their own persons; and hence the Lord gave direction to Israel, thus: "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you; I am the Lord." (Lev. 19:

UMI

28.) "Ye are the children of the Lord your God. Ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead." (Deut. 14: 1.)

"The heathen nations not only did these things in honor of their gods, but in grief for the death of a relative. The Scythians, as we are informed by Herodotus, were accustomed to slash themselves on the death of their king: and Virgil represents the sister of Dido tearing her face with nails, and beating her breasts with her fists. The Persians even now cut and lacerate themselves when celebrating the assassination of Hossein." (Bagster's note on Deut. 14: 1.)

Sir J. Chardin says:

"Concerning the people of Asia, their sentiments of joy or grief are, properly, transports; and their transports are ungoverned, excessive, and outrageous. When one returns from a long journey, or dies, his family burst into cries that may be heard twenty doors off. Especially are those cries long in the case of death, and frightful; for their mourning is right down despair, and an 'image of hell.'" (*Cottage Bible;* note on Gen. 50: 10.)

Cicero endeavored to believe in the conscious survivance of the soul after death, and its immortality as taught by Plato; but abandoning this as the best light and only hope he had of a future life, in his heathenism, without the gospel and gospel hope, he became bewildered and sorrowful in the contemplation of man's mortality. And on the death of a beloved daughter, whom he loved with all the fondness of parental affection, in the thought of her being consigned to endless oblivion, sad and disheartened, he retired to a private and secluded retreat for the rest of his days, and neither the earnest entreaties of personal friends nor the demands of his country, which he greatly loved, as her most eminent statesmen, even in the misfortunes of the State, could draw him from his pensive retirement. Here is a man of the first genius and powers of intellect bending under the weight of grief, from which he never recovers, as a sad illustration of one who sorrowed having "no hope" for his departed dead!

A Greek poet of master mind writes his own pitiful lament in the following verse:

"The meanest herb we trample in the field,
Or in the garden nurture, when its leaf
In Autumn dies, forebodes another Spring,
And from brief slumbers wakes to life again.

Man wakes no more! Man, valiant, peerless, wise,
Once chilled by death, sleeps hopeless in the dust,
A long, unbroken, never-ending sleep."

When one visits the places of burial and sepulture of the Ancients, and those who have laid away their dead without hope of a future life, and reads upon the monuments and tomb-stones the inscriptions expressive of the sorrow and grief of surviving relatives and friends over their deceased, they cannot but be struck with the affliction which must have haunted their saddened minds and hearts, as they buried their dead without hope.

Prof. G. W. Green, for many years U. S. Consul at Rome, says:

"You cannot take ten steps in the Lapidarian Gallery of the Vatican without feeling that you are standing between two worlds. On one side are the inscriptions of paganism, whose dead, sinking into their graves without hope, seem to cast back lingering glances upon the pleasures they have left behind. The mourner has nothing to console him, the dying man nothing to cling to; but when the name has once issued from the fatal urn, he leaves forever his woods, his villas, and his home for the bark that is to bear him to an eternal exile. Then from his tomb comes a cold voice that chills you by its heartlessness; and idle enumeration of idle pleasures, or a spiteful warning that yours too will soon be ended."

He gives us several examples, some of which we here transcribe:

D·M·

TI CLAUDI SECUNDI. HIC SECUM HABET OMNIA BALNEA VINUM VENUS CORRUMPUNT CORPORA NOSTRA SED VITAM FACIUNT.

B·V·V·

"To the divine manes of Titus Claudius Secundus. Here [in this world], he has with him everything. Baths, wine, and lust ruin our constitution, but they constitute life what it is. Farewell—farewell."

Prof. Green well exclaims:

"What language for the grave! You remember the dying question of Augustus to his friends: 'Have I played my part well? Then applaud me.' Shocking as this is to our conceptions, even from such a wretch as Augustus, the following inscription is still more so:

"VIXI DUM VIXI BENE JAM MEA PERACTA MOX VESTRA AGETUR FABULA VALETE ET PLAUDITE.

"V·A·N·LVIII·

"While I lived, I lived well. My play is now ended: soon yours will be. Farewell, and applaud me!"

In a volume entitled the *Catacombs of Rome*, published by the "American Sunday-school Union," I find the following examples:

A disconsolate mother thus bemoans her lost child:

CAIUS JULIUS MAXIMUS. Æ. TWO YEARS AND FIVE MONTHS. O RELENTLESS FORTUNE, WHO DELIGHTED IN CRUEL DEATH! WHY IS MAXIMUS SO EARLY SNATCHED FROM ME—HE WHO LATELY USED TO LIE BELOVED, ON MY BOSOM! THIS STONE NOW MARKS HIS TOMB. BEHOLD HIS MOTHER!

And here is another similar inscription of lamentation over a son by an affectionate and bereaved mother:

HIS MOTHER FUSCA, LEFT TO SORROW AND GROANING, BURIED HIM, MOIST WITH TEARS AND BALSAM, IN THIS SEPULCHRE.

Oh! how much these bereaved mothers needed the comforting hope of the gospel as they sorrowed because "their children were not," and supposed death to be an eternal extinction of being. How consoling would the words of the prophet to weeping Rachel have been to them, had they heard their announcement:

"Thus saith the Lord: Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border." (Jer. 31:16, 17.)

Coming down to later times, it is said of Gibbon, the celebrated historian of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, who had his mind early tinctured with the principles of infidelity, and who discarded the doctrine of the soul's immortality as taught by the heathen world, and discredited the revealed doctrine of the resurrection from the dead to a future life; that "he left this world in gloomy despondency without those hopes and consolations which cheer the Christian in the prospect of immortality."

Hume has the following remarkable passage in his treatise on human nature, which betrays his unanchored hopes:

"I am affrighted and confounded with that forlorn solitude in which I am placed by my philosophy. When I look abroad, I foresee, on every side, dispute, contradiction, and distraction. When I turn my eye inward, I find nothing but doubt and ignorance. Where am I, or what? From what causes do I derive my existence, and to what condition shall I return? I am confounded with these questions, and begin to fancy myself in a most deplorable condition imaginable, environed with the deepest darkness."

Diderot, when dying, after a life of doubt, skepticism, and disappointment, said to his friends who stood by his bed-side to close his eyes in death, "I am about to take a leap in the dark." And dark, indeed, is "the land of darkness and the shadow of death," without the gospel hope.

Lord Byron, who sought for happiness only in the vanities and pleasures of a sinful life, but was disappointed at every step, endeavors to find comfort in the thought of future oblivion in death. He writes:

"Ay, but to die, and go alas!
Where all have gone, and all must go;
To be the nothing that I was
Ere born to life and living wo!
Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen;
Count o'er the days from anguish free;
And know, whatever thou hast been,
'Tis something better not to be!
Nay, for myself, so dark my fate
Through every turn of life hath been,
Man and the world so much I hate,
I care not when I quit the scene."

But how little comfort could this give him, when he penned the following lines, which must have been the utterance of the deeper convictions and emotions of his heart, which were found written in his Bible after his death:

"Within this awful volume lies
The mystery of mysteries;
Oh! happiest they of human race,
To whom our God has given grace
To hear, to read, to fear, to pray,
To lift the latch, and force the way;
But better had they ne'er been born,
Who read to doubt, or read to scorn!"

In view of burying our dead, or departing this life only to pass into eternal oblivion, we may well say with the Apostle we "sorrow not" as they. And our American poet has well

UMI

expressed the sad reflections and unassuaged grief of those who anticipate so dark a fate:

"Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine thro' his Cypress trees!
Who hopeless lays his dead away,
Nor looks to see the breaking day
Across the mournful marbles play."—*Whittier.*

II. *Christian believers sorrow not as those who endeavor to find comfort in the false hope of the soul's immortality.*

The ancient Egyptian funeral rites gave rise to the fables which were afterwards improved upon by the Greeks, of the river Styx, Charon and his boat, in which the supposed spirits of the dead were ferried to "Elysian Fields."

"Here [Memphis, Egypt] was the famous Acherian lake; now a solitary marsh and a dirty pool of water are all that remain. Here was a beautiful sheet of water, fed by canals; its shores ornamented by shady groves and beautiful parks. These were the waters over which the dead were ferried to yonder tombs and sepulchres. To this lake the mummied dead corpse was brought. Forty-two persons, constituted judges, ranged themselves around the remains of the departed one. 'Has any one ought to allege against the character of the deceased?' In the scales of justice his life was balanced. If it was proved that he had spent his life in dissipation and vice, transit was denied him till his friends could atone for him. Those Elysian fields, and those quiet shades of the departed, were for the good alone. If accepted, the ferryman received the pious freight, and bore it beyond the flood.

"These obsequies of the dead seem to have been emblematic of their ideas of future judgment and retribution. I saw in Dr. Abbot's Museum, in New York, a magnificent funeral papyrus roll, twenty-two feet long, taken from one of the very tombs of yonder great cemetery..... The deceased is held supported by two or more gods. In another place in the roll is a picture of the hall of the 'Two Truths,' with the god Osiris sitting in judgment, assisted by the forty-two judges, standing near him. Before him stands the soul of the deceased, accompanied by Anubis, the guardian of the tombs, and the Ibis-headed god Thoth. This god has been writing down the history of the departed, and has collected all his good deeds. The result is made known by the god Thoth to Osiris, who awards such punishment as he and his forty-two assistants deem best.

"That lake and those judgment scenes have lessons for us. Vividly do they remind us of the Christian's Jordan of death, and our transit to the presence of the great Judge of all the earth, and the solemn awards of an impartial tribunal. Many of these singular customs, connected with the dead, might afford us lessons of instruction now." (*Handwriting of God*, pp. 183, 184.)

Thus, we perceive, we have the origin of the fables respecting the judgment at death, and the rewards of the dead in "Elysian Fields" immediately on decease, and their ferriage across the "river." And have not "these singular customs connected with the dead," among the ancients, afforded "lessons of instruction now;" and the "River Styk" been converted into "the Christian's Jordan of death, and our transit into the presence of the great Judge of all the earth; and the solemn awards of an impartial tribunal," at death?

Dr. Young sings:

"Man's hour is up, and we are gone;
Our little bark is burst on Charon's shore."

And these, otherwise beautiful, verses sung in nearly all Christian congregations, illustrate the same fact:

"There is a land of pure delight,
Where saints immortal reign;
Where endless day excludes the night,
And pleasures banish pain."

This is true of the "new earth," and "the world to come;" but of no "spirit land!"

"There everlasting spring abides,
And never withering flowers."

Yes, this is true in the restitution.

"Death, like a narrow sea, divides
That heavenly land from ours."

To most of the saints, the sea is wide, and they are still in it, uncrossed.

"Sweet fields beyond the swelling flood,
Stand dressed in living green;
So to the Jews old Canaan stood,
While Jordan rolled between."

Those sweet and heavenly fields, prospective before the Christian's eye of faith, are indeed "beyond Jordan;" *i. e.*, the river of Judgment, and not the "River of Death."

"But timorous mortals start and shrink
To cross this narrow sea;
And linger shivering on the brink,
And fear to launch away."

UMI

This is because for the judgment is substituted death, which is ever an enemy (1 Cor. 15:26), even to the saints!

"Could we but climb where Moses stood,
And view the landscape o'er;
Not Jordan's waves, nor death's cold flood,
Should fright us from the shore."

We can, if we will ascend the mount of prophecy at the invitation of the angel: "Come up hither, and I will show thee things to come." (Rev. 4:1.) Then shall we behold what is described in Tit. 2:13, 14; and in Is. 25:6–8; 1 Cor., ch. 15, and not as

"——tim'rous mortals start and shrink,
And fear to launch away,"

but boldly venture, and in most exalting and rapturous hope. (1 John 3:1–3; 4:17,18; Luke 21:28–31; Rev., ch. 21.)

David Hume jested about "Charon" and the passage accross the "River Styx," knowing the origin of the fable, and from whence Christians borrowed it! Why should Christian men give occasion for the ridicule of their "blessed hope" by substituting "fables" for the word of God? Says Dr. Dick:

"Infidel scoffers have been led to conclude that the Christian's heaven is no object to be desired; and have declared that they could feel no pleasure in being suspended forever in etherial regions and perpetually singing psalms to the Eternal. And it is incomprehensible also that a sensitive being should exist furnished with all the organs and functions requisite for animal life, and yet of a size ten thousand times less than a mite."

The ancient Egyptians believed, too, that the soul tarried with the body, or visited it, so long as the body remained entire; hence they sought the art of mummying the dead. They also built costly sepulchres, and covered the walls with pictures, paintings, and hieroglyphics, and even furnished the apartments as if for the living, designed to entertain the souls of the dead. To this most ancient custom, the Patriarch Job no doubt alluded, though far from entertaining the fabled notion: "For now should *I have lain still* and been quiet, I should have *slept;* then had *I been at rest*, with kings and counsellors of the earth, which *built desolate places* for *themselves.*" (ch. 3:13, 14.) The roaming of the souls of the dead without "quiet," "sleep," or "rest"—their wakefulness during the night of death—and their having enjoyment and entertainment in visiting the "desolate

places" of sepulture of the body after death, had no place in this Patriarch's faith: "Our rest together is in the dust." (ch. 16:13–16; and chs. 14 and 19.)

"Why do they wish for the hallowed-out rocks?
Or wherefore the beautiful monuments crave?
Unless 'tis believed that the body but slumbers,
And is not abandoned to death in the grave."

This conclusion of Prudentius is seen to be in a measure correct, so far as the Egyptians were concerned, from the following statement of Rev. Mr. Ellis:

"The Egyptians believed in the *immortality* of the *soul* and the *body*. This led them to the custom of mummying the dead, and the excavation of most costly sepulchres, adorned and beautified in every manner. They expected to return to their original bodies at some future time, and desired to find them not only perfect, but in such habitations as they might not be ashamed of. They expected to resume their bodies and inhabit the Nile valley. That this was their theology I think cannot be questioned."

The heathen world thus began with the doctrine of the immortality of both the soul and body, but finally abandoned the latter as entirely hopeless, inasmuch as not even the embalmed body ever was awakened by the spirit to life; but they retained still the doctrine of the soul's immortality as the only hope of future existence.

We must not overlook the fact, too, as we pass, that the Egyptians believed in the transmigration of souls; as did the Greeks after them, as taught by Plato, that they passed after death into both "human and brute forms." What a hope! Nothing consoling surely! All concerning the dead is dreary uncertain; but this is most repulsive! The thought of the spirit, or soul, in their judgment, entering into a cat, or dog, or crocodile, or serpent, or any other unclean or clean animal or reptile, could not afford, certainly, much consolation. How deplorable and wretched all hopes of this kind must have been respecting the dead! No wonder that in Egypt, even to this day, where the same idea is entertained concerning the departed, that there is so great lamentation over their dead!

Among the Greeks, Socrates was the great master and defender of the doctrine of the soul's immortality; but neither he nor his eminent disciple, Plato, ever were fully satisfied with their

UMI

philosophy of a future life, or were supported with the certainty of their hope. Socrates says:

"The hazard of believing is noble, and it is right to *allure* ourselves with such things as with *enchantments*. Though I should be mistaken, I gain at least thus much, that the expectation makes me less uneasy while I live, and *my error will die with me*."

In his dying address to his judges, before drinking the fatal poison, he says:

"I go to death, you to life; but that which will be for the best the Divinity only knows."

Thus, at the best, the untenable doctrine of the soul's immortality, and its survivance after death, was uncertain, and could not afford any satisfactory hope, even to this its most eminent and ardent advocate in the hour of dissolution. Contrast this language of Socrates with that of the Patriarch Job, and see the confidence and faith and assurance and triumphant hope which support him in the hour of departure:

"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in the last day I shall rise out of the earth. And I shall be clothed again with my skin, and in my flesh I shall see my God; whom I myself shall behold, and not another: this my hope is laid up in my bosom." (Job 19:25–27, *Douay vers.*)

What confidence, what assurance, what satisfaction the Patriarch finds in the doctrine of the resurrection! While on the other hand, the testimony is incontrovertible that all hope founded on the immortality of the soul afforded no satisfactory, comforting, or confident expectation to any thoughtful mind.

THE CATACOMBS OF ROME, AND THE FAITH AND HOPE THEY REVEAL.

In the earlier inscriptions found in the catacombs of Rome, upon the tombs and burial places of the Christians, we find no intimations of the doctrine of the soul's immortality, or of rewards in death, or of any comforting hope drawn from the heathen conjecture. This famous labyrinth is thus described:

"The catacombs of Rome were excavations made at first for the purpose of obtaining building material for the city. As Rome stood on seven hills, it was an easy matter to open quarries in the hillsides, and here, undoubtedly, the work began.

The earth in that neighborhood abounds in loose, porous stone, called *tufa*, composed of volcanic cinders, or ashes, which, by the agency of water containing lime in solution, has formed a rock that is quite soft in its original bed, but hardens on being exposed to the air." (*Catacombs of Rome*, p. 38.)

The following few inscriptions, or epitaphs, selected from the many, will show the idea of the early Christians respecting the state of the dead, and their hope of a future awakening from the dead to eternal life of those who have "fallen asleep in Jesus:

PRIMITIUS, IN PEACE; AFTER MANY TORMENTS, A MOST VALIANT MARTYR.

The following two, it is stated, "were of a later date, but in the same spirit:"

PAULUS WAS PUT TO DEATH IN TORTURES, IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT LIVE IN ETERNAL BLISS.

CLEMENTIA, TORTURED, DEAD. SLEEPS: WILL RISE. (p. 87.)

"Here is one," says the author of the *Catacombs of Rome*, "which may serve as a fair specimen of a great number." He then gives a *fac simile* of the original in Latin. Translated, it is as follows:

LANUS, CHRIST'S MARTYR, RESTS HERE. HE SUFFERED UNDER DIOCLETIAN.

And here is one who suffered under the brief persecution under Julian:

HERE LIES GORDIANUS, DEPUTY OF GAUL, WHO WAS EXECUTED FOR THE FAITH WITH ALL HIS FAMILY: THEY REST IN PEACE.

Prof. Green, to whom I have before alluded, says, remarking upon the Lapidarian Gallery at Rome: "The Christian writes nothing upon his grave but the simple expression of his faith." And he gives the following examples, with others:

FLORENTI· IN PACE.
"Florentius in peace."

VALERIA· DORMIT IN PEACE.
"Valeria sleeps in peace."

UMI

DORMITIO ELPIS.
"The sleeping-place of Elpis."

"Often the expression," he says, "is fuller and more distinct, referring this peaceful slumber to the Lord who gives it; as in the following form, which is found at the close of many inscriptions:

IN PACE DOMINI DORMIT.
"He sleeps in peace of the Lord."

"The resurrection of the body, the idea that, to a pagan, would have seemed still stranger than the more common assurance of peace, being held up as the end of this temporary slumber."

RELICTIS TUIS IACES IN PACE SOPORE MERITA RESURGIS TEMPORALIS TIBI DATA REQUIETIO.
"Thou well deserving one, having left thy (relations), lie in peace—in sleep. Thou wilt arise. A temporary rest is granted thee."

"Indeed," says our author, "it is to this belief in the resurrection of the body that we are indebted for the preservation of these precious remains. The Christian living in the midst of a hostile community, and often dying the most degrading or revolting death, would have frequently been tempted to cast aside, with comparative indifference, the mutilated remains of the friend whose spirit he knew to be far beyond the reach of human decay. [This, however, did not constitute the faith of the early Christians: else why is it not somewhere expressed upon their graves, as in after years of a corrupt theology under the apostasy?] But when he saw in them, all disfigured as they were, the substance which was to rise again refulgent with the immortality of Paradise, he gathered them together with a pious care, washed and anointed them, and filling the wounds with spices and precious ointments, laid them reverently in the sepulchre."

The author of the *Catacombs of Rome* gives us the significant meaning of the word "cemetery," with the following remarks:

"This, we have already said, means *a sleeping place.* The early Christians were the first to apply it to a place where their dead were buried; for they were the first who fully believed in a resurrection. As therefore they saw their friends lie down to sleep at night, in sweet assurance that they would rise again with the dawn, refreshed in both mind and body, so did they commit the bodies of their deceased friends to the tomb in as full and as

sweet an assurance that ere long they would awake again and rise in new power and beauty, and also immortal.

"What the rising sun was daily to a slumbering hemisphere, all that and even more would the coming of the glorious *Sun of righteousness* be to all his followers who had died upon the earth. How natural, then, that they should speak of death only as a soft, sweet sleep! And who can wonder that they should have covered their tombs as they did with these delightful intimations that their friends had only laid themselves down to rest awhile, and would in due time awake and rise to a better and happier life? How superior this to the poor consolations which the pagan Romans found in their thought of death! The doctrine of their life often was, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' Let us enjoy all we can while we live, for death will soon put an end to all our joys! The better class of Pagan epitaphs breathe the language of despair, illustrating what the apostle Paul had in mind when he told his fellow-Christians at Thessalonica that *they* should not 'sorrow as others who have no hope.'" (p. 128, 129.)

Again the author says:

"In contrast with this fatalism, stoicism, and despair, how cheering the idea of the Christian's repose in death! Passing therefore from these pagan epitaphs to those which are Christian, is like emerging from the darkness of the catacombs into the sweet, bright light of day.

"A common Roman name for a grave was, 'My eternal home,' or dwelling of the dead, a name which could be retained no longer when the gospel had 'brought life and immortality to light.' Not satisfied with the Latin word *sepulchrum*, which meant only a place for burial, they employed most generally for the purpose one of the sweetest and most pleasant words which language afforded; and from that time till now, the place where Christ's beloved followers are buried is called a *cemetery*—or place *of* sleep." (p. 131, 132.)

"No heathen would ever have said or thought so sweet a thing of death as that it is only a peaceful sleep. (p. 207.)

Soon, however, the hope of the resurrection became obscured by that of another, and this became the expressed faith of the Apostasy, while the words IN PACE SOPORE and RESURGIS and RESURGAM were abandoned, as the false hope took the place of the real one. Here is an epitaph which the author of the *Catacombs of Rome* thinks "may have been composed somewhat later, and placed over the grave of one who was known to have suffered at the time alluded to, as, at this day, a new monument is frequently erected over the grave of a person who died fifty or a hundred years ago:"

UMI

"In Christ. Alexander is not dead, but lives above the stars, and his body rests in this tomb. He ended his life under the Emperor Antonine, who, although he might have foreseen that great benefit would result from his services, rendered to him hatred instead of favor. For while on his knees, and about to sacrifice to the true God, he was led away to execution. O sad times! in which, among sacred rites and prayers, not even in caverns could we be safe. What can be more wretched than such a life? and what than such a death? where they cannot be buried by their friends and relations! At length they sparkle in heaven." (pp. 99, 100.)

What a manifest departure from the simplicity of the faith of the first Christians, as seen upon their graves in the inscriptions of their epitaphs. The terms *sleep* and *resurrection*, expressive of the condition in death, and the hope of the gospel, are both here abandoned, and another hope is substituted and made to appear, namely: "Alexander is not dead, but lives above the stars." He "sparkles in heaven."

This is a most flagrant departure from the primitive faith, language, and hope of the Christian Church in the beginning; and none can fail to see from whence comes the departure.

And others follow of a similar character, thus:

"In Christ. Aestonia, a traveling virgin, who lived forty-one years and eight days. She departed from the body on the fourth before the calends of March."

"Lawrence, to his sweetest son Severus, borne away by angels on the seventh ides of January."

These and like inscriptions are interspersed with those retaining the Scriptural faith and hope uncorrupted, as taught in the Scriptures and entertained by the early Christians. But here is another of like import, maintaining the error of rewards in death:

"Marcus, an innocent boy. You have already begun to be among the innocent ones. How enduring is such a life to you! How gladly will your Mother, the Church of God, receive you, returning to this world. Let us restrain our groans, and cease from weeping."

Believers in such a hope as is here expressed endeavor to comfort themselves and "restrain their groans, and cease from weeping," with the thought that their dead are "among the innocent ones;" and "in heaven, in the enjoyment of eternal life,"

and also the capability of spirit communication with this world, *i. e.*, the "Mother Church!" The origin of this hope is manifest. It is traced to the Church of Rome. This youth [boy], it is claimed, is not dead, but living. This reminds us of an anecdote of a person returning from the funeral of a child, who when asked by another, "Where have you been?" replied, "To bury a live child!" The interrogater asked an explanation, with astonishment, to which the person answered: "The *minister* said the child was not dead, but I thought it *was*."

In our modern cemeteries epitaphs abound declaring the dead to be "not dead, but living." And often this is expressed by the symbol of a hand and index finger pointing upward, with the significant meaning, with sometimes words to express the idea, that the sleeper has taken flight "beyond the stars," or "sparkles in heaven." Assuming, as in one instance observed by the writer, where this symbol is used, together with the language used by the angel over the open sepulchre of Jesus after his resurrection from the dead—"He is not here; for he is risen" (Matt. 28: 6)—that the departed was indeed risen from the dead as was Christ!

And we have seen the following over the graves of the dead:

> "'Tis but the casket that lies here:
> The gem that filled it sparkles yet,"

conveying the same false and fabled hope.

In all this character of inscriptions upon grave and monumental stones, the comforting and true hope of the gospel is entirely lost sight of, and that of the Papal Church substituted in its stead.

In the heathen world such false hope gives rise to all manner of speculations and superstitions respecting the condition of the dead. And so it does in more enlightened Christendom, where it is entertained.

In China, the superstition prevails that the spirits of the dead need to be provided for by the living, in order to be preserved, and carry on their varied employments in the spirit world. Tables are set and loaded with provisions to give them sustenance. Paper garments, and articles of manufacture, are made; and all manner of articles and instruments and utensils, for the carrying on of business and trades—together with gold and silver tissue paper, is prepared and provided, with which to furnish the spir-

UMI

its money to carry on their business in the spirit world! And as the spirits are invisible, these articles must also be made invisible, which is done by burning them! Millions of money are thus expended to take care of the dead, under the superstitious notion that if they do not, these spirits of friends will turn demons and inflict upon them the most terrible calamities. The headless trunks, fallen in battle, must have heads stitched upon them with all speed, less the spirits appear headless in the spirit-world, and be dragged by demons to regions of terror, darkness, and insufferable torture!

Similar superstitions prevail among all barbarous nations and tribes. The American Indians fear to leave a fellow comrade in war upon the battle-field to be scalped, lest his spirit haunt them with terrible evil and judgments.

"In Lapland, when one approaches his dissolution, his friends are unwilling to attend him in his last moments. As soon as he expires, they quit the place with the utmost precipitation, apprehending some injury from his ghost, which they believe remains in his corpse, and delights in doing mischief to the living. They place an ax, with a tinder-box, by the side of the corpse of a man, and scissors and needles of a woman, so that they may take care of themselves in the spirit land.

"In Catholic countries, the masses are without end for the repose of the souls of their departed friends, or their deliverance from purgatory! However poor the relatives, they must deprive themselves of everything to accomplish this humane act.

"And in Russia, after the corpse is dressed, a priest is hired to pray for the soul, to purify it with incense, and sprinkle it with holy water while it remains above ground. When the body is carried to the grave, which is done with many gesticulations of sorrow, the priest produces a ticket signed by the Bishop and another clergyman as the deceased's passport to heaven. This being put into the coffin between the fingers of the corpse, the company return to the house of the deceased, where they drown their sorrow by intoxication, which lasts forty days! During that time a priest says prayers every day over the grave of the deceased. Though they do not believe in purgatory, yet they imagine that their departed friend may be assisted by prayer in his long journey to the place of his destination after this life." (Goldsmith.)

Thus is the doctrine of the soul's inherit immortality and survivance in death the foundation of all superstitions and errors and fables respecting an imaginary, conscious, intermediate state, or state of future life after death, among all peoples; affording in no

single instance satisfactory, sure, and comforting hope, as does the promise of the gospel—"the better resurrection."

How much more consistent, reasonable, and comforting the Scriptural idea respecting the condition in death, of a sweet, undisturbed sleep, repose, and rest; and how much more cheering and joyful the hope of the resurrection from the dead to the life everlasting, in the kingdom of God, than all these speculative and imaginary and fanciful faiths founded in heathenish ignorance and a corrupt and perverted theology of an apostate Christianity which has endeavored to put out the better hope.

Archbishop Whateley's remarks upon the intermediate state are just to the point here, and I cannot forego the pleasure of transcribing them in the close of my article:

"One objection to the reception of this supposition—an objection which affects the imagination, though not the understanding—is, that it seems as if there were a tedious and dreary interval of non-existence to be passed by such as should be supposed to sleep, perhaps for some thousands of years, which might elapse between their death and the end of the world. The imagination represents a wearisome length of time during which those that sleep in Christ would have to wait for his final coming to reward them. We fancy it hard that they should be lost to the world and to themselves—destitute of the enjoyments both of this life and of the next, and continuing for so many ages as if they never had been born. Such, I say, are the pictures which the imagination draws; but when we view things by the light of the understanding, they present a very different aspect. Reason tells us that a long and a short space of time are exactly the same to a person who is insensible. When any one looses his consciousness (as in the case of a fainting fit, or those recovered from drowning, suffocation, apoplexy, and the like), he not only does not perceive the length of the interval between the loss of his consciousness and the return of it, but there is (to him) no such interval; the moment at which he totally lost his sensibility seems (and is, to him), immediately succeeded by the moment in which he regains it. It is also illustrated by persons in sound sleep.... The moment of his awaking shall appear to him immediately to succeed that of falling asleep. And the contrast of passing a night of restlessness—how insufferably tedious a single night! how enormously long the interval between the times of the clock's striking! how we seem to feel as if the morning would never arrive. The long and dreary interval between death and the day of judgment (supposing the intermediate state to be a profound sleep) does not exist at all, except in the imagination. To the party concerned there is *no* interval whatever; but to

each person (according to this supposition) the moment of his closing his eyes in death will be instantly succeeded by the sound of the last trumpet which shall summon the dead; even though ages shall have intervened. (*Future State*, p. 80.)

"When the solemn trumpet soundeth o'er the couch of all the world;
And the curtain, thick of darkness, shall forever far be hurled;
What a morning then shall break o'er the opening eyes of earth;
What a rush of mighty terror then shall hush the sounds of mirth.

"When shall break that solemn morning o'er the nations wrapped in sleep;
Oh! that we may not be with them who will tremble then and weep;
May we hear the Master calling from the realms of cloudless light,
'Come hither, rested sleepers, Come, for there is no more night.'"

FIRST THINGS AND FIRST THOUGHTS ON AWAKING.

"As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." (Ps. 17:15.)

Paul tells us that "the hope of the resurrection" was not only that for which he, as a preacher of it, was persecuted, but that it was also the theme of all the prophets and of Moses. That is, the hope of the gospel was the hope of the law and of the prophecies: the hope is *one*. (As see Acts 26:6–8.) The resurrection, therefore, was not only "the hope of Israel," "to which all the twelve tribes....hope to come," "but the resurrection of the dead"—"of the just"—"the first"—and "the better resurrection" is THE hope of all scripturally intelligent believers. It is proper enough to say that our hope is in Christ, in his blood, his death, his resurrection, intercession, and all such things; but the culmination of all hope is in OUR PERSONAL RESURRECTION *from the dominion of death* by our Lord Jesus Christ, who is "the resurrection and the life," "at his appearing and kingdom," when "he shall judge the quick and the dead." So "when Christ our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory." Christ's death and blood were the means of purchasing our release from death and its dominion, but it is the *actual resurrection of the person of each believer* that confers the release, and gives the longed-for deliverance—"the redemption of the body." This, therefore, is "the grace that shall be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ."

I propose in this article to draw some fair and natural inferences from these sweet words of David. The text is one of

most thrilling interest to every true, waiting, watching, praying, and hoping believer. We shall inquire, What will probably be the saints' experience as to first things and first thoughts on awaking in the resurrection? Saith David: "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness."

The great future is to us, while yet in this age, mysterious, notwithstanding the many intimations of it found in the Book of God. Yet, coming to a close and pious and reverent contemplation of it in connection with given stand-points and circumstances, many things of surpassing moment and interest suggest themselves to us, not only as highly probable, but from the nature of things, morally certain.

I. From all that we can gather out of the teachings of revelation, what can be more natural than that our very first thought on awaking will be the *fact* of it? Instant as a lightning flash will rush into the minds of the awaking saints the Scriptures which taught it, and led us to hope in it, and expect it. The full import and beauty of our baptism into Christ's death and in hope of resurrection will also now show itself with a significance and grandeur that none can at present realize, and when all who never were "baptized into Christ's death," and thus "planted together in the likeness of his resurrection," will certainly wish they had been. As each saint awakes and opens his eyes in the light of "endless life," it does seem to us impossible that any thought can have a precedence in any mind to this thought. It is a fact! a true, actual, personal resetting up; resurrection from the sleep of death! As he looks at this fact, sees it, feels it, realizes it in himself, and in myriads of others like himself all around him, having now "immortality, incorruption, power, and glory" stamped on every feature, limb, and action, his first thought is bound to be, "It is a fact, I am here, raised from the dead, a spiritual but literal person: I—me—my own very self again!" These reflections, however, will be, we suppose, but momentary. The immortal eye will be flooded with the brightest visions, and the mind with a world of the most transporting thoughts.

"Thoughts on thoughts a countless throng,
——chasing countless thoughts along!"

II. Next to that of the fact of our resurrection, we have no doubt will be the sight and thought of Jesus. A man just pick-

ed up from shipwreck would naturally and first of all realize and think of his salvation, but his second thought and inquiry would surely be about his savior. How even immortal minds will bear the first sight of Jesus, I cannot now conceive. They will all see him, and "see him as he is" at this moment in the "heaven of heavens" in "all his glory;" as he was, was also for forty days with his disciples after his resurrection until his ascension, which he occupied in speaking to them "of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Also as he will be in the great day of awaking; "the same Jesus who was taken from them into heaven." I say, what will be the saint's first thoughts and feelings on *first seeing, with his own living eyes, his very living Redeemer in his kingdom and glory?* I cannot tell, and will not attempt to describe. Will our first thought be to fly to his feet like the holy Mary at his sepulcher, and seek to embrace him, and in that manner show him our gratitude and affection? It may be so: it seems natural, and accords perfectly with John's visions of these things in Rev. 5:8–10, who saw the twenty-four elders who "fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints [referring to this present age]; and they sang a new song, saying: Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth."

Oh! with what transport, pure, holy, ardent, intense, rapturous, will our first thoughts on seeing Jesus retrace all the past! Right before us, no veil, no cloud; a fact to our open vision stands the "Child born, the Son given, the wonderful Counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Father, Prince of peace." Oh! how lost in mortal ecstacy to look for the first time on him who turned the water into wine, was immersed in the Jordan, tempted forty days of the devil; the very agonizer in blood and sweat, the condemned of Pontius Pilate, the crucified between two notorious malefactors at the instigation of "his own" who "received him not;" the dead, the buried, resurrected ascended, and now returned Jesus; King of saints, Lord of glory, Monarch of worlds, principalities, powers; in all the glory of his Divine Father, his own glory, and that also of his holy angels. On his head the "many crows" of the universe, his great Father's own

hands having put the royal ensigns of universal government on his shoulders, with all the kingdoms of this world his own forever! Can you conceive what shall be our first thoughts and feelings on first seeing all this? I confess I cannot. My poor mind is yet too tiny, and my thoughts too mortal. I believe, however, that unworthy as I am, sinful as I am also as yet, a poor, imperfect worm at best, still, through his grace, I have a hope within me of soon realizing and actually seeing for myself all that my pen now writes of, and infinitely more than has yet ever entered into my heart. This rich, sweet hope of mine is the "glory of all my brightest days and the comfort of my nights of sorrow." It is all likewise of his grace; his sovereign favor. I merit nothing, deserve nothing: am only a sinful child of dust, redeemed with the precious blood of that Jesus of whom I speak, whom I love, in whom I do heartily believe, and in whom believing I rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory, in the sweet hope that soon both I, and all mine, shall be with him and like him, serving him day and night in his temple forever.

III. I think the saints' next thought on awaking will, in all probability, be a thought of wonder and amazement at finding *themselves actually there.* Not implying any possibility of unfaithfulness in God to any of his promises, but only in review of our own past. Our sinful propensities, unbelieving hearts, and constant liability to deception; our indolence, worldliness, unequal tempers, foolish tongues, selfishness, covetousness, lovelessness, strife, trouble-making propensities, fretfulness under affliction, repinings for adversity, the little that we knew of God's word, or sought to know, the much that we accepted and depended upon which never had foundation in the truth of the gospel, the little that we prayed, or gave to the Lord, the little good that we did in the church, or the world, or ever sought to do; I say, in review of these things, it will at once astonish us that we are really saved and are there in "the first resurrection." How rapidly we shall recall to our minds all the previous facts of our personal history; our being all born in sin, living in sin so long without repentance, our natural hatred of holiness, disregard of God, despising of his commands, neglecting Christ, trifling with things of salvation! Oh! how we shall wonder that we are there! Shall we not *shout?* Every one of us trying to out-shout the others? Oh! yes, until our immortal voices ring and echo through all hights, and depths, and breadths, and

lengths of the New Jerusalem with, "Hallelujah to our own glorious Jesus forever!" Our being raised from the dead, being there our very own selves, and with our own eyes seeing Jesus as he is, all a blessed fact, it might seem,

IV. That our next thought would probably be like this: *Is this blessedness of glory to be ours forever?* Is it true that I am now immortal and incorruptible? That I shall sin no more forever? Get sick no more? Is it true that the joys of these first moments in heaven will all be abiding? Eternal? And while these thoughts may for an instant be revolving in our minds, a divine satisfaction will instantly put an end to every such thought with the yea and amen of God: "It *is* all forever!" But I must think that about this must be the time for us to look around on all the raised and glorified millions, and

V. To think of the loved ones. Notwithstanding there may be, and certainly will be many missing ones in that "first resurrection," because of their having died in their sins, yet there will be many loved ones there: not lost, but found; not dead, but alive; whom "we shall know even as also we are known." Blessed, holy, happy thought! This is bound also to be true. Adam in the garden of Eden was perfectly himself without any previous history, because he had none, being only just created; but we could not be ourselves if we had not each a personal history, because we shall be re-created, having been before. Were we to be simply made in the resurrection as Adam was in Eden, without any previous history, then it would not be a resurrection, or setting up again, but a creation, and we should not be our own selves, but simply creatures. As such we might be very happy, but if we could not identify ourselves, neither others, and know even as now known, then how could it be a resurrection—the bringing of us, our very selves back with Christ, which God promises? It must be "these vile bodies," and this "it" which is here "sown a natural body" must be the same "it" that is "raised in incorruption." Scripture, therefore, settles this point so interesting and important to us all, and entirely to our satisfaction. If our very selves in the resurrection, then we see readily the blessed provision which is necessarily in store for our fullest enjoyment of such hereafter as were dear to us here, but then dearer than ever. Thus Paul says that his converts at Thessalonica "will be the crown of his rejoicing in the day of Christ." Neither let us imagine any difficulty in finding loved

ones then because of the infinite multitudes around us, and the fatigue of wandering over such extended regions in search of them.

There will be nothing of this any more. We shall not travel then with labor and toil as we do now, because we shall not be dependent on the activity of arterial circulation, and the strength of muscle, and energy of morning freshness. We shall not be "born of the flesh" there, but "of the Spirit." This mortal shall put on immortality, and this corruptible incorruption, and that which was sown in weakness shall be raised in power, fashioned like unto Christ's own glorious body. We shall, in all probability, move with the act of volition. Christ says that we "shall be like unto the angels"—equal to the angels. How long was the angel Gabriel in coming to inform holy Daniel that the Lord had answered his prayer? It was but an instant—while the prophet was yet praying. (Dan. 9: 21.) I think it likely the mere volition will be the saints' motive power. How the angels fly I cannot tell. They do fly, and the saints shall be "equal to them"—shall be as the angels. We at once, therefore, get rid of all idea of labor and fatigue. It will be but to wish—but to will, and we are there. And, think you, will it not be the most delightful employment to be conceived thus to pass around the infinite hosts of the glorified, seeking out those we knew and loved, sojourned and toiled with in this vale of tears and sorrows; whom especially we loved because they loved Jesus? There is my godly father, my precious mother, my own companion, dearer than myself, and our sacredly-loved children; brothers, sisters, pastors, deacons, Sabbath-school teachers and pupils, neighbors and friends. Who can yet conceive the ecstacies of these first meetings and greetings in eternal day, and our first thoughts! The holy New Jerusalem, with all its blazing splendors of gold and precious stones, and pearls, and tree of life, beautiful river, and even its beautiful angels, will seem for a moment to be forgotten in the bliss of this final and eternal reunion of parents, and families, and friends, together now, all like our Lord, and with him forever.

It does seem to us that next to the joy of seeing our Jesus, will most certainly be that of seeing our own loved ones, now to be one and inseparable, each rejoicing in "the power of an endless life." Oh! how *last* thoughts will also comingle with these transporting *first* thoughts! The deaths which separated us on.

UMI

earth, the distress of hearts, and desolation of homes, which those separations brought to us who survived; and then again to those who survived us, and so on through untold generations. It will also be to us only as it were but last night. Though many ages may have passed since we died, yet they will be to us as nothing more than "a dream when one awaketh." We knew not anything after our death—"in that very day our thoughts perish." (Eccl. 9 : 5–10; Ps. 166 : 4.)

Our *last* thoughts in death will, therefore, be the very next ones preceding our *first* thoughts on awaking, in point of order, whilst in point of *time* there will be no time at all, because "the dead know not anything." Abel's last thought was, "Cain, my own brother, has smote and killed me. I die!" His next thought is, "I am alive! I am risen from the dead!"

Oh! what an eternity of bliss is before us! Think of the interest with which we shall listen to the recitals of worldly trials and deliverances, from such as Adam and Moses, Abraham and Job, Isaac, Jacob, and Jeremiah, the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, witnesses of Jesus from all lands and ages, every moment feeling new power and transport in the thought that we ourselves and ours are now all again together and forever, with no dread of evil or thought of being separated again, through all the grand future eternity of God! Then, too, there will be the wondrous work of redemption and grace, and of our individual perseverance in spite of the evil human nature, Satan and sin, to all this final glory. Oh! what work for eternity to praise and magnify the love of God, the grace of Jesus, and the power of the Lord, the Spirit, by whose gracious work we were kept in spite of everything to all this bliss and glory. We shall begin with the story of the first Eden, the first temptation, the first sin, the first promise; and onward we shall pass to the days of Noah, Abraham, David, Jesus, the apostles, the abomination that made so great desolation in the earth—its supreme curse. Daniel will explain the image and beasts; John the vials, seals, trumpets, and plagues. Oh! how these holy men will thrill us with their details of God's doings and showings to them while on this earth, and of his faithfulness to us their children. We shall also, with Moses and Elijah, review the grand old Hebrew ritual in all its details and splendors of antiquity in type and promise. Thence also we shall go to Bethlehem, Gethsemane, Calvary, and the garden-sepulcher. Oh! how differently we

shall then see all these mysteries to what we do now or can, with the full blaze of eternity's light around us! What is now mystery, will then be simple; and what is now irreconcilable to us will then only create our astonishment that we ever stumbled, while every one's highest astonishment—even Abraham's, David's, Paul's, and John's—will be that they themselves are really there!

Then think, too, of the fact of our eternal intercourse, so free, full, and delightful, with all those great characters of early times—not the Alexanders, Cæsars, Wellingtons, and Napoleons, of sword, fire, and bloody memory—but those good and venerable saints of God, whom the mighty of this world knew not nor cared for, only to persecute and evil entreat them. With what delight shall we, who never did or suffered anything for Christ, in comparison with them, listen to the stories of their doings and sufferings! How we shall bend over the living lips of the father of the faithful telling about the offering up of his only Isaac as grandly typical of Jesus! Also of the distinguished patriarchs, while telling how they endured, through God's grace, such and such "cruel mockings and scourgings, bonds and imprisonments;" with apostles also, and millions of others who submitted for the sake of Jesus to every manner of indignity from this blind world, being devoured of wild beasts, and burned alive, and killed in divers ways and forms of cruelty, as witnesses of Jesus. Glorious host of noble martyrs! Sufferers once, but conquerors now! Oh! how the grand chorus will keep rolling round the vaulted universe as the falling waters of a mighty cataract—"Worthy is Jesus, hallelujah!"

The splendors of the heavenly state I dare not essay to meddle with. I have no thought, no powers of mind or imagination to conceive anything of it. Neither of the personal appearance of the Lord Jesus, the King on the throne of his glory, and the universal homage that shall then be done to him by all the powers and the principalities of the heavenly place. Nor can I begin to conceive the beauty and perfection and glory of everything of this (yet) sin-cursed and stricken, but (then) regenerated planet, as it will be, when "instead of the thorn it shall bring forth the fir tree, and instead of the briar the myrtle tree, which shall be to the Lord for a name, and for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." Oh! how strange our first thoughts there! While, as we look around from the earth's radii to its circum-

UMI

ference, we shall see not a sepulcher, nor a grave stone, nor an emblem of sorrow anywhere; no coffin, no hearse, no crape, nor mourners going about the streets. Neither shall we ever again listen to desolating tempests and howling oceans, the shrieks of shipwrecked multitudes, the terror-striking tramp of marching armies, the news of mighty navies, or contending nations making havoc and sporting in lust and blindness with the sorrows of a helpless race. No, God be thanked, none of these any more! Not another trace of this work of demons forever, nor a lone vestige of it shall ever again be seen; neither of the men or the nations who delighted in war, for the Lord shall have scattered them, and they who gloried in blood shall have received their recompense in both kind and measure. Instead of which things, all is now peace forever under the blessed reign of the "Prince of peace." Oceans now roll, and winds blow, and lambs and tigers gambol, oxen and wolves play and roar only in unison with the choral anthems of a redeemed and glory-filled earth. Satan is destroyed, his works abolished, and God is now as in Eden of old before Adam sinned, "All in all."

My fellow-pilgrims to the kingdom and glory of God, mighty joys await you! Lift up your heads, and be valiant to the end of the journey and conflict. It is but a little while and you are more than conquerors through the blood of the Lamb! Look, then, steadfastly at the things "not seen as yet." Think of them, long for and pray for them. *These are not "cunningly devised fables;" they are the great facts of revelation, "the faithful and true sayings of God."* Oh! hie thee onward, holy pilgrim! the hights of Zion are almost seen, the glory of God's house on the tops of the mountains begins to show itself in the mellow dawnings of time's foretold fullness. Oh! sleep not in this "City of Destruction;" spend not thy precious moments in accumulating perishing riches. Haste! oh! up and haste to the gleaming ensigns of the coming King of Israel! "Come, Lord Jesus; come quickly!"—*Anon.*

EVENING BY EVENING.

Good night, ye gems of beauty,
  Good night, thou gentle blue;
On quiet bed I lay me,
  And bid farewell to you.
Good night, ye wakeful woodlands,
  Good night, ye sleeping flowers,
Amid whose smiles and odors
  I've pass'd day's wayward hours.
Good night, ye star-tipped mountains,
  Old friends, the tried and true;
Good night, ye wandering waters;
  Ocean, good night to you.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

Good night, dear faces round me,
  Night's hours will swiftly run,
And we shall say, good morning,
  At the ascending sun.
The farewell hour is coming,
  The last good night is near,
When I shall part in silence,
  With those who loved me here.
Then, all my farewells over,
  Just passing out of sight,
Unweeping and untrembling,
  I'll *look* my last good night.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

Yet not good night forever;
  For he, who is my day,
Will wake me soon—I see him,
  Already on his way.
No, not good night forever;
  I shall but sleep in him
Who shall arouse me early
  While yet the dawn is dim,
Who shall arouse me early,
  And bid this flesh arise,
In glorious resurrection,
  To meet him in the skies.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.

I see him—lo, he cometh—
  Himself the morning light,
To bring the dawn of gladness,
  The dawn that knows no night.
O Bridegroom of the morning!
  Bright bringer of the day,
Put on thy fair adorning,
  Thy beautiful array.
Lord Jesus, star of evening,
  Yet star of morning too;
Earth's new created splendor
  Rise on our longing view.
    Good night to all, but not to thee,
    My God, who ever art with me.—*Bonar.*

UMI

THE TRINITY.

By Eld. E. Royce, Altona, Ill.

"They have erred from the faith."—*Paul.*

Among the various items of faith which when embodied constitute the creed of what is termed 'orthodoxy,' none holds a more conspicuous place than the one named at the head of this article, embracing in its theory under the appellation of the Triune God, a plurality of gods, three distinct persons, yet one in substance, equal in power and glory. This dogma is intimately and perhaps inseparably connected with the doctrine of the innate immortality of man, and peculiar sanctity is attached to it in this connection, as an essential element of the true faith, which cannot be ignored by any person deserving the name of Christian. This being the case, it becomes a matter of importance to the truth-seeker whether this claim is well founded; whether this doctrine was taught by Jesus and the Apostles, or whether it was introduced into the church from another source, at a later day, and elaborated by sectarian machinery for party purposes. In order therefore to arrive at a correct conclusion concerning this matter, and believing Paul's rule—"Prove all things, hold fast that which is good"—to be a safe one to follow, we will submit to the test of truth as revealed in the Bible concerning the former point, and the record found in reliable church history concerning the latter, willing to abide the result, and hoping the candid reader will be ready to do the same.

In submitting this doctrine to the test of the Scriptures, the only true source for light on what we must believe in order to be saved, we find one important truth revealed, which if sufficient of itself to substantiate the prevalent view, would settle the question forever: I mean the pre-existence of Christ. This is emphatically declared, as recorded in John 16: 28; 8: 58, and by implication in several other places. But while this is true, there are also two other facts in the same connection which materially modify the force of the argument in that direction, namely: (1) He never gave the apostles the slightest intimation whatever of any act or agency performed by him during that period of time; and (2) he never claimed an equality with the

Father in the sense suggested by this doctrine, but (see John 17, &c.) distinctly asserted his entire subordination. So while the apostles evidently believed in his pre-existence as a matter of faith, they also believed the particulars concerning it were a secret with the Father, who (Luke 10: 22) *only knew who he was.* Consequently they did not agitate the question, or make it an essential part of their teaching. "Great is the mystery of godliness *which*[1] was manifest in the flesh," said Paul to Timothy; but he did *not* tell him that manifestation was the second person in the Trinity.[2]

On the other hand, the apostles believed Jesus to be what he declared himself to be—the *Son* of God; and dwelt fundamentally on the necessity of believing on him as their Savior, King, and future Life-giver, who died, was buried, rose again, ascended to heaven, was then seated at the Father's right hand, and would *personally* come again at the end of the age and give eternal life to his waiting people; exhorting them to purify their souls by obeying the truth, and thus prepare for that important event. This in substance was their teaching to the people both Jews and Gentiles, at all times and in all places, and there is no evidence that this doctrine, which has since become so important, formed any part of the faith of primitive Christianity.

The question, then, is naturally suggested, From whence did this dogma arise; and how came it to gain the important place it now holds in the creed of professed Christendom? In reply to the first part of this question I remark negatively, that the doctrine of a Triune God, whether true or false, did not originate from the teachings of Jesus or the apostles; for like some other theories which have been incorporated into the faith of popular Christendom, it lies at the base of the mythologies of the more civilized ancient heathen nations. For example, concerning the Hindoo mythology.[3] They believe in one God, *Brahm*, a self-existing, incomprehensible Spirit, whose three essential attributes are personified and worshiped under the respective names of Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. The ancient Egyptians[4] also worshiped the deified attributes of their gods in *triads.* A representation of a triune god is also found among

[1] I substitute the word *which* (or who) in place of *God* in this quotation, because it so reads in the most ancient manuscripts.
[2] The word *trinity* was first used in the church sometime in the second century. (Euter.)
[3] Moore. *Hindu Pantheon*, p. 242.
[4] Wilkinson. *Ancient Egypt*, 2d Series, vol. 1, pp. 185, 231.

UMI

the antiquities of Assyria.[1] A trinity can also be traced through all Chinese philosophy and religion.[2] Says DuHalde:[3] "The substance of Fo is *one, but he has three forms.*" Again the "Orphic Trinity" according to Cory[4] was a *triad* subordinate to a *monad.* The Greek philosophers Pythagoras, Parmenides, and Plato also recognized the same doctrine.[5] We thus learn it was not dependent upon a revelation from God for its origin.

To answer this question affirmatively, to show how the transition was effected from Christianity as it was in the Apostolic age to Christianity as we find it in the age of the Fathers; from Christianity as taught by Jesus and the Apostles to Christianity as we find it taught in the fourth and fifth centuries, and, to a great extent, in the popular church ever since, and thus show the rise of this doctrine, is perhaps in some respects a more difficult task. For in the words of the Rev. Dr. Stanley of the Church of England:[6] "No other change equally momentous has ever since affected its fortunes [Christianity], yet none has ever been so silent and secret. The stream in that most critical moment of its passage from the everlasting hills to the plain below is lost to our view at the very point where we are most anxious to watch it. It is not so much a period for ecclesiastical history as for ecclesiastical controversy and conjecture." The change truly was great, and history is somewhat meager concerning it: nevertheless we will endeavor to gather the substantial facts as far as practicable.

In the first place the divisions which had been fermenting during the Apostolic day through the influence of false teachers, (as often referred to in their writings[7]), after the Apostles had passed away increased in volume, and caused the church to be divided and subdivided into a great variety of sects. These were greatly multiplied by the Gnostics,[8] in abstruse philosophic discussions concerning the deductive meaning of words and phrases found in the Gospels and Epistles. They were not satisfied with what was revealed concerning the pre-existence of Christ,[1] but claimed to be able to understand by their superior knowledge certain things concerning it and his inherent nature; which, if true, are not revealed in the Scriptures. "It is no wonder," says Tertullian,[2] "if the ingenuity of philosophers perverted the Old Testament, since men sprung from them have corrupted even the New Testament by their opinions, so as to support the tenets of their philosophy." These philosophical speculations, aided by similar ones borrowed from Greek philosophy[3] and introduced by converts from heathen nations infected by it, engendered the primary elements of this doctrine in the church. On this point Knapp remarks:[4] "They found in the New Testament some expressions (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit) which apparently resembled their previous philosophy. ....It was therefore easy to annex their former philosophic notions to the language of Scripture." Mosheim[5] also says in reference to the same point: "Whatever is to be met in Scripture respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was expounded by these Christians [*i. e.*, the Alexandrian school] so as to render it consistent with the doctrine of *three hypostases* or natures in God, *as maintained by Plato, Parmenides, and others.*" And thus from Greek philosophy and the abstruse speculations of the Gnostics were gathered the elementary principles of this doctrine which is now held sacred as a part of the revealed Word, by modern orthodoxy.

But at this point of time the idea was comparatively in an embryo state; for while it had many nominal adherents, they were afloat on a sea of conjecture, as well they might be, without a "Thus saith the Lord" for a pilot; consequently, some rejected it altogether, and held the opposite view, that Christ was but a mere man, which at that time was not considered inconsistent with Christianity.[6] Irenæus (A. D. 157)[7] expresses his views upon the question as follows: "If then any one says to us, After what manner is the Son derived from the Father? we say to him

[1] Layard. *Second Expedition*, p. 160.
[2] Williams. *Middle Kingdom*, vol. 2, p. 197.
[3] *China Glossary*, vol. 1.
[4] *Ancient Fragments*, pp. 354, 355.
[5] Cudworth's *Intellectual System*, ch. 4, s. 36.
[6] *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, p. 36.
[7] Rom. 16: 17, 18; 1 Cor. 1: 10, 11; 3: 3, 4; 15: 12; 2 Cor. 2; 17; Gal. 1: 6, 7; Phil. 1: 15; 1 Tim. 1: 5, 7, 19, &c., &c.
[8] They believed that man was composed of a soul which is of *celestial* origin, and which would aspire to worship the true God were it not that the other half of his nature, which is a corrupt body, supercedes all its more virtuous desires, and attaches it to its pursuits of sensuality. (Ruter, p. 16.)

[1] From the imperfections of the Jewish dispensation the Gnostics (wise or knowing) hastily inferred that it was not instituted by the Supreme Being: and assuming that pompous appellation, boasted their ability to restore to mankind that knowledge of his [Christ's] nature which had so long been lost. (Ruter, p. 29.)
[2] *Apology*, ch. 47.
[3] This philosophy, which involved the truth of the Gospel in subtlety and obscurity, and *added to the doctrine of Christ the commandments of men*, became in time extremely prejudicial to the Christian cause. (Ruter, p. 36.)
[4] *Theology*, p. 179.
[5] *Comm. Affairs of Christ. before Const.*, ch. 2, p. 159—Note.
[6] Hasse. *History Christian Church*, p. 98.
[7] *Whiston's Works*, vol. 4, p. 157.

UMI

that no one knows the probation or generation, or nuncupation, or aduperation, or whatever name any one pleases to call this generation which is ineffable. Not Valentinus, nor Marcion,[1] nor Basilides, nor angels, nor arch-angels, nor principalities, nor powers; but only the Father who begat, and the Son who was begotten." Notwithstanding the opposition, however, the doctrine that Jesus was the incarnate *logos*[2] (a Greek term for the divine will or energy, borrowed from Platonic philosophy), whose existence they held was co-eval with the Father, became prevalent in the church as early as the close of the third century.

About this time the world became excited by the promulgation of a new theory by Arius, of whom Ruter[3] writes as follows: "The Trinitarian controversy was a deluge which overflowed the whole Christian world. Arius, a presbyter of the church of Alexandria, acute, eloquent, and subtle, contended in opposition to his bishop, Alexander, in an assembly of presbyters, that the Son was essentially distinct from the Father: that he was a dependent, spontaneous production, created by the will of the Father out of nothing; that he had been begotten before all worlds; but that there had been a time when he was not; that the Father had impressed upon him the effulgence of his glory; and transfused into him his ample Spirit; that he was the framer of the world and governor of the universe in obedience to the will of his Father and Monarch." This theory, so contrary to the prevailing opinion that he had existed as the *logos* from the beginning, was bitterly opposed by many, while others warmly sustained it. Thus arose the noted Arian controversy, which so distracted the church that Constantine (A. D. 323) summoned the bishops and doctors of divinity from all parts of his Empire to meet in General Council at Nice in Bithynia, to settle the question. After a stormy debate of two months continuance the Arians were defeated, and the majority concocted and adopted the following creed:[1]

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible, and in our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten of the Father, that is of the *substance* of the Father, God of God, and Light of light, true God of true God, *begotten*, not *made;* con-substantial with the Father; by whom all things were made, both which are in heaven and on earth, who for the sake of us men and on account of our salvation, descended, became incarnate and was made man, suffered, arose again the third day and ascended into the heavens, and will come again to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in the Holy Spirit."

Concerning the doings of this Council which established the above creed, Ruter thus writes:[2] "The term consubstantialist was conferred upon the opposers of the Arian doctrine by the council of Nice, the object of whose assembling has been already specified. In this council the Homoousian doctrine, or consubstantiality of *the three persons in the Godhead*, was declared a fundamental article of the Christian faith, and has been received as such by the Greek, the Latin, the Oriental, *and the Protestant Churches.*" It will be noticed however that this council, although they made this declaration, did not incorporate the doctrine of the trinity into their creed, but merely said concerning the third person, "We believe in the Holy Spirit;" hence there were at that time, according to the established belief, but *two* persons in the Godhead. But fifty-six years afterwards, at the General Council at Constantinople, they deposed Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, as a heretic for denying the personality of the Holy Spirit, and added to the Nicene creed, after the words *and we believe in the Holy Spirit*, the words—"the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father; who with the Father and Son together is worshiped and glorified; who spake by the prophets." Thus was introduced into the religious creed of Christendom the three persons constituting the Trinity; in reference to which Ruter remarks:[3] "These doctrines con-

[1] Noted Gnostics.

[2] It may be objected that the true *logos* was not derived from Platonic philosophy, inasmuch as John uses it in the first chapter of his gospel: "In the beginning was the word [*logos*]." In reply to this I remark, that I have proved by quotations from Knapp and Mosheim that the Platonic philosophers when brought into the church applied their philosophic notions to the names Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; also that some of these notions were that there were "three hypostases or natures in God;" and another was, that "God made all things through his *reason* or *word*," which term in Greek was *logos*. This they personified as being distinct from God. Again, it is evident the doctrine of the *logos* was not obtained from Scripture, from the fact that Augustine as late as the ending of the fourth century acknowledged (Lardner, vol. 3, p. 440) that after he renounced Manicheeism, he regarded Christ to have been a mere man *until he had read certain Platonic writers*. Again, if the Nicene Fathers had believed John taught the personal pre-existence of Jesus by his use of this word, why did they not use his testimony in their furious debates in the Nicene Council? In such an exciting time, when such testimony would have been so valuable, their entire silence upon it is presumptive evidence that no one in that age believed John taught it.

[3] Ruter's *Gregory*, p. 81.

[1] I give the Nicene Creed as I find it in Socrates' *Church History*. I find however in Eusebius' epistle to the Cæsareans an addition to it, but no change in the doctrines, as follows: "And the Catholic and Apostolic church doth anathematize those persons who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not; that he was not before he was born; that he was made from nothing, or of another substance or being; or that he is created, or changeable, or convertible."

[2] Ruter's *Gregory*, p. 73.

[3] *Ib.*

cerning the nature of the Trinity, which in preceding ages *had escaped the vain curiosity of man*, and had been left *undefined by words* and *undetermined by any particular set of ideas*, excited considerable contest through the whole of this century. The semi-Arians violently attacked *the divinity of the Holy Spirit*, which was in the General Council of Constantinople discussed and defined, and the doctrine *of three persons and one God* established as the orthodox belief of the church."[1] But although thus established by the power of the majority, the agitation of the question continued, for it was difficult to reconcile the facts that Jesus hungered, thirsted, and slept; also that he prayed to the Father, and not only suffered but *died* on the cross, with the fact alleged in their creed that he was the eternal Father himself. To meet this perplexing question, Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, asserted,[2] "that there were in the Lord Jesus not only *two natures*, but *two persons*, one of which was the second person in the Trinity, and the other was the man Jesus, who possessed a human soul as well as body." This speculation not being congenial to the doctrine of the Trinity as enunciated in the creed, was condemned, and another Council called to settle the matter of the distinction between our Lord's divine and human nature. This Council assembled at Ephesus, A. D. 431, where it was determined[3] "that the Lord Jesus Christ in his exalted state was *one divine person*, in whom *two natures* (*i. e.*, divine and human) were most closely and intimately united, but without being mixed or confounded together."

Thus was elaborated in substance the doctrine of the Trinity as held sacred by orthodoxy to-day. And concerning the Councils which thus established it as an essential ingredient in the Christian faith, the Rev. H. Milman thus writes:[3]

"Nowhere is Christianity less attractive; and if we look to the ordinary tone and character of the proceedings, *less authoritative*, than in the councils of the church. It is in general a fierce collision of two rival factions, neither of which will yield, *each of which is solemnly pledged against conviction.* Intrigue, injustice, violence, decisions on authority alone, and that the authority of a turbulent majority, decisions by wild acclamation rather than after sober inquiry, detract from the reverence and impugn the judgment at last of the later Councils. Even the

[1] Hook's *Church Dictionary.*
[2] Mosheim, vol. 1, p. 379.
[3] *History of Christianity*, vol. 1, p. 157.

venerable Council of Nice commenced with mutual accusals and recriminations which were repressed by the moderation of the Emperor. The degeneracy is rapid from the Council of Nice to that of Ephesus, where each party came determined to use *every means* of haste, manœuvre, court-influence, and bribery to crush its adversary; and neither would scruple at any means to obtain the ratification of their anathemas by the persecution of the civil government."

I have now briefly brought to view the "voice of the Church" concerning what we must believe about Jesus in order to be orthodox, as enunciated by the Fathers in their several councils up to the middle of the fifth century. And although the agitation on this question did not entirely cease for several centuries after, yet no important changes were made in the doctrine, and the belief in the Trinity as determined by the Ephesian council is substantially the belief of popular Christendom at the present time.

And now I wish to call attention to an important fact, important as eternal life is important, left out of their creed, and consequently practically out of their faith, and not theirs alone, but of all denominations since who hold this doctrine as enunciated by them; for there is no doctrine more vital, none which stands in bolder relief throughout the Apostolic writings, than the fact that Jesus not only suffered, but *died*, and was RAISED FROM THE DEAD. By referring to their creed we perceive this item *was left out;* for they say he "suffered and rose again the third day;" thus ignoring the fact that he literally *died* and *was buried.* Nestorius, as before suggested, saw this inconsistency, and tried to amend it by asserting that Christ possessed not only two natures, but two distinct persons, and that the unity with the Father "was only of *will and affection.*" By this theory the Nestorians held the *man* Jesus literally died. But this view was condemned as a heresy, because it ignored the doctrine of his being *of the same essence* with the Father. Afterwards "Eutyches, an abbot of Constantinople, advanced and maintained the doctrine that there was only *one nature* in the Lord Jesus Christ; that he had a celestial body and not one of flesh, and consequently that his divine nature both suffered and died." This theory, admitting the death of the Son of God according to the plain declaration of Scripture, obtained many adherents, but was as objectionable with the dominant party as the Nestorian view, and

UMI

the dissensions arising therefrom caused the calling of the fourth General Council, which met at Chalcedon, A. D. 451. This Council condemned Eutyches and his followers as heretics, and again affirmed that the orthodox faith was, that there were "two perfect and distinct natures, the divine and human, in the *unity of the person* of the Lord Jesus." Consequently the conclusion was inevitable, as his person was consubstantial (of the same substance) of the Father, he could not *die* in the literal sense of ceasing to exist; but when crucified the human nature only suffered, the divine beholding the scene physically unaffected, and upon its conclusion immediately accompanied by the soul of the penitent thief, ascended to Paradise.

This, in substance, is the doctrine of a Triune God, as established by the Fathers in their several Councils, and held sacred by orthodoxy to-day. And now I ask the candid reader to examine it carefully and compare it with the record God has given of his Son in his Word, and if you find it harmonizing with it, believe the dogma: but if on the other hand you find the record positively declares that God gave his only-begotten Son to *die*, the just for the unjust, to bring men to him, and save them from *perishing*, and this declaration backed by abundant apostolic testimony that he did literally die and was buried, not his body alone (Acts 2: 27), but his 'soul' also, and three days after was as literally by the power of the Father raised soul and body from the dead; if I say you find this plainly taught in the Bible, notwithstanding the decisions of Ecclesiastical Councils, or the frowns of popular orthodoxy, fearlessly endorse the record as there given, and unflinchingly defend it: for the Holy Scriptures alone "are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

Says Joseph Wolff, in a note to his remarks concerning the Fire-worshipers of Persia (Journal (1831), p. 79): "It is remarkable, that I have not hitherto met with a sect who believe in everlasting punishments, except Christians: neither Jews, nor Parsees, nor Buddhists, nor Hindoos believe it."

HAS HE COME?

By Eld. Geo. Thomson, Attica, Wis.

"If it were possible they shall deceive the very elect."—*Jesus.*

All Christians admit that the doctrine of the second coming of Christ is plainly taught in the Scriptures of divine truth. None will attempt to deny the statement of our Savior[1]—"And if I go and prepare a place for you, I WILL COME AGAIN." But all are not equally harmonious in their interpretation of the *manner* and *time* of his coming, whether his promise to return to this earth again is to be understood in a literal, or a spiritual sense; whether that promise, made by him who declared "heaven and earth shall pass away, but my *word shall not pass away*," has had its fulfillment in the past, or is an event still in the future; each of those views are entertained by the disciples of Jesus, and with honesty and sincerity no doubt. Yet those views are conflicting. Both cannot be correct: which is wrong? All Christians are profoundly interested in the decision. If this can be determined accurately it would doubtless tend more than any other one thing to reconstruct and harmonize the conflicting theories of modern Christianity, and bring about that union of believers so ardently longed for by all the disciples of Jesus. It is proposed in this article to investigate this important subject with the spirit of truth and candor, in the light of reason and Scripture. If it can be proven that Christ has already come, let us accept the evidence, and harmonize the Scriptures with that theory: if, on the other hand, it can be clearly demonstrated that he is yet to come literally, let us be candid enough to admit the fact, with its concomitant truths.

In the Scriptures relating to the second coming of Christ it is also predicted that certain events and circumstances will stand associated with that event: hence, when he comes, those events and circumstances must necessarily attend, or follow. In the early part of the year 1860 it was announced that the Prince of Wales would visit the Canadas, and that when he came he would inaugurate the great Victoria Tubular Bridge over the St. Law-

[1] John 14: 3.

rence River at Montreal; that he would also open the Crystal Palace at the same place for the Provincial Industrial Exhibition; and a number of other more or less remarkable or important acts were to be associated with his visit to Canada. When he came those things were accomplished, and when accomplished they were evidences that he had come. Let us now look at some of the announcements concerning the coming again of our Savior to this earth, and see if we can learn anything about the *manner* of his coming, and *what he will do* when he comes.

I. When he comes, literal and visible clouds will be associated with his advent.

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came *with the clouds of heaven.*"[1] It may be objected that this is a vision, therefore indefinite and uncertain in its application. The evidence shall not rest here; let the Savior speak: "And they shall see the Son of man coming *in the clouds of heaven.*"[2] "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man....coming *in the clouds of heaven.*"[3] The same declaration is recorded in Mark 13: 26 and Luke 21: 27. These clouds have been considered as merely symbolic, and have been popularly explained to mean clouds of events: but Jesus says, *clouds of heaven.* Clouds have always been conspicuous in the divine manifestations. In the exodus of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt the Lord went before in a cloud. In the passage of the Red Sea also the cloud was an important agent in their protection. Again in the wilderness, "the glory of the Lord appeared in a cloud."[4] Also, on Mount Sinai God spoke to Moses out of a cloud. Moses also entered the cloud, and when he came out his face was radiant with glory. The cloud rested on the tabernacle in the wilderness. When it was taken up, Israel journeyed; when it rested down, they halted. At the dedication of Solomon's Temple a cloud of glory filled the house. On the Mount of Transfiguration a cloud forms an important part of that exhibition in miniature of the future kingdom and glory. Those clouds were evidently something more than mere banks of fog, vapor, or smoke: they were clouds of glory—but none the less real and visible on that account.

Subsequent to the resurrection of the Lord, he remained with

[1] Dan. 7: 13.
[2] Matt. 24: 30.
[3] Matt. 26: 64.
[4] Exod. 16: 10.

the disciples forty days, "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," and then,[1] "while they beheld, he was *taken up;* and a *cloud* received him out of their sight." Will any one assert that Christ ascended to heaven spiritually *in a cloud of events?* I believe the first attempt is yet to be made by any Christian to deny the literal ascension of Christ into heaven. If this fact then be conceded, what will we do with the testimony of the angels in v. 11—"Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? THIS SAME JESUS, which is taken up from you into heaven, *shall so come* IN LIKE MANNER as ye have seen him go into heaven." There can be no appropriateness in this emphatic language, unless the *coming again* is a counterpart of the *going.* Add to this the evidence of John[2]—"Behold, he cometh *with clouds,* and every eye shall see him," and the point is established beyond controversy.

II. When he comes the holy angels will accompany him.

"For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels."[3] "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and *all the holy angels with him.*"[4] "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words,....of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father *with the angels.*"[5] "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven *with his mighty angels.*"[6] Whether the second coming is past or future, these attendants—the angels and the glory—have been, or will be, inseparably connected with the event.

It may be claimed that all these might have attended a spiritual coming, as angels have been known to be present, yet invisible; but at that time those holy angels have a work assigned them, which will cause all of God's elect, at least, to be sensible of their presence. "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect, from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."[7] And again, as we learn from the following Scripture, a task is given them which can scarcely be accomplished without sinners being cognizant of the fact: "The Son of man shall send forth his an-

[1] Acts 1: 9.
[2] Rev. 1: 7.
[3] Matt. 16: 27.
[4] Matt. 25: 31.
[5] Mark 8: 38.
[6] 2 Thess. 1: 7.
[7] Matt. 24: 31.

gels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity."[1] When God sent his angels to gather his elect out of Sodom, and to destroy the wicked inhabitants thereof, both classes were aware of their presence. If that glory so frequently referred to as an accompaniment of the second advent was ever revealed, it most certainly was witnessed.

Our Savior's first advent was in humility and weakness, his second is to be in glory and power. The characteristics of his first advent were apparent, those of his second will be none the less so. Where is the record of these manifestations? Judge ye if they are in the past.

III. When he comes there will be a general lamentation.

"And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn."[2] "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and *all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.*"[3] It would be a most difficult and forced construction of terms to make "all the tribes of the earth" mean only the tribes of Israel, and "all kindreds of the earth" merely the Jews at Jerusalem. The Savior cautioned his people against this very mode of interpreting his coming. "Wherefore, if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert! go not forth. Behold, he is in the secret chambers! believe it not. [Why?] For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so *shall also the coming of the Son of man be.*"[4] This certainly teaches that his coming will not be clandestine, and known only to a few. It will not be in the desert, where no eye can see him; neither in the secret [or private] chambers, where the good man is compelled to yield to the pow- of his greatest enemy [death]: but it will be as universally apparent as the lightning's flash. "EVERY EYE SHALL SEE HIM."

IV. When he comes there is to be a resurrection from the dead.

"For the Lord himself shall *descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first."[5] "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised."[6] "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his

[1] Matt. 13 : 41.
[2] Matt. 24 : 30.
[3] Rev. 1 : 7.
[4] Matt. 24 : 26, 27.
[5] 1 Thess. 4 : 16.
[6] 1 Cor. 15 : 52.

own order. Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's AT HIS COMING."[1] Here is an event of importance, the resurrection of the righteous dead, at least, associated with Christ's coming. If a literal resurrection of the dead is taught in the Bible, it is clearly located at no other point of time. If Christ's second coming is in the past, then the sleeping saints have been resurrected. If the saints have not been resurrected, then the second coming of the Lord is an event still future.

But, says the objector, this is a spiritual resurrection. If a *spiritual resurrection*, it must be from a *spiritual death*, which is understood to be "*dead* IN *trespasses and sins.*" But those we have spoken of[2] are said to be "*the dead* IN *Christ.*" None but the severely obtuse can fail to discern the difference.

V. When Christ comes the second time, he will judge the living and the dead.

"I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick [living] and the dead, *at his appearing* and kingdom."[3] "Therefore judge nothing *before the time* UNTIL THE LORD COME, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart."[4] Here the great Assize is clearly identified with the Second Advent. The great Apostle exhorted to a suspension of judgment until the *proper and legitimate time*, and declared that time to be WHEN THE LORD COMES. This seems to be in strict accord with reason, also, that man should not be judged until the end of the age, or dispensation. The idea that when men die they do immediately appear before God to be judged finds no authority whatever in the word of God. The Scriptures above quoted and referred to, prove (1) that God hath appointed a specific time to judge the world; (2) that time will be at, or subsequent to the second coming of Christ; and (3) the judge will be the Lord Jesus Christ.

VI. When he comes every man will get his reward.

"And behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give to every man as his work shall be."[5] "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and THEN he shall reward *every man* according to his work."[6] If there is

[1] 1 Cor. 15 : 22, 23.
[2] 1 Thess. 4 : 16.
[3] 2 Tim. 4 : 1.
[4] 1 Cor. 4 : 5. See also Matt. 25 : 32, 33; Acts 17 : 31.
[5] Rev. 22 : 12.
[6] Matt. 16 : 27.

any reliance to be placed upon language as representative of ideas, these words clearly and unmistakably locate the time when *all* shall be rewarded; and no less clearly associate that very important transaction with the second coming of Christ. If that event is in the past, then every man has received his final reward! Will any one assume such a position? The alternative is the coming of the Lord is still future. If any class of men should be peculiarly favored of heaven and be made exceptions to this rule, we might reasonably conclude it would be the holy prophets. But we learn[1] that they too must wait until the resurrection and judgment for their reward. "*And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.*"[2]

VII. When he comes he will sit in his throne as King, and his saints shall reign with him.

"When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, THEN *shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.*"[3] There would be no propriety in this statement if the Savior had occupied *his* throne prior to that time. And the Savior has declared (in effect) since his ascension into heaven, that he is not yet seated on his own throne—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me *in my throne*, as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father *in his throne.*"[4] The grand old prophetic statements on this subject are also in full harmony with the above. "And I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him, and there was given him *dominion* and GLORY, and a KINGDOM."[5]

The pious worthies of all time have been cheered by the prospect of a home in the kingdom, and this hope has not been a baseless expectation, but a well-grounded assurance, predicated upon the promise of the Redeemer: "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom."[6] "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the

[1] Rev. 11:18.
[2] 1 Pet. 5:4.
[3] Matt. 25:31.
[4] Rev. 3:21.
[5] Dan. 7:13, 14.
[6] Luke 22:29, 30.

kingdom."[1] One grand and glorious strain of the anthem of redemption, as sung by the Apocalyptic host, is this: "Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall *reign on the earth.*"[2] But when shall this be? When shall these "exceeding great and precious promises" have their fulfillment? The following Scripture supplies the answer: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory.... THEN shall the KING say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Futher, *inherit the kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world."[3] Then will that prayer (which is still proper and legitimate), that long-uttered petition, have its fulfillment—"Thy kingdom come!"

We conclude by referring to a fact, which is of itself a standing witness that the Lord has not yet come. We allude to the continued celebration of the Lord's Supper: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death TILL HE COME."[4] In this Scripture there is set forth not only the object of the Lord's Supper, but a plain limit to its duration as an ordinance—"*till he come.*" If he has come, the continuance of that ordinance in the church is inconsistent and unnecessary, because it has expired by limitation. But the ordinance is still perpetuated in the church, and every time the Christian partakes of those emblems of the broken body and shed blood of his Savior, he testifies by that act that his Lord has not yet come.

Other evidences might be presented in harmony with the foregoing to prove the fallacy of the idea of a spiritual coming at the destruction of Jerusalem, or at any other time. But enough has been presented to show which theory is sustained by Scripture evidence.

The reader will not fail to discern the important fact, that the resurrection, judgment, and reward of the saints are all dependent upon the second personal advent of their Lord. This fact wherever understood invests that event with extraordinary and absorbing interest, and gives force to Paul's fervent exhortation, the latter clause of which is now so sadly neglected in the professed church, that "we should live soberly, righteously, and

[1] Luke 19:22.
[2] Rev. 5:10.
[3] Matt. 25:31, 34.
[4] 1 Cor. 11:26.

UMI

godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ." [1]

MISSIONARY THEOLOGY:

CONSIDERED IN ITS TWO DOCTRINES OF ENDLESS MISERY, AND A POST-MILLENNIAL ADVENT OF CHRIST.

The Rev. Dr. Mullens, Secretary to the London Missionary Society, in a recent work entitled *London and Calcutta*, designed to trace the outlines of Protestant Missions in India, and to stimulate the flagging zeal of their supporters, asks, "Why have Missionary Meetings failed so greatly to attract young men?" "Why are the very churches which once supported them best now giving to them only half of what they gave thirty years ago?" "Where are the crowded meetings which welcomed Williams, and Moffat, and Knibb, and listened to their stories?" "Were a DEEP, SETTLED INTEREST felt by Christian men at large in mission work abroad, these things could not be." Dr. Mullens answers these searching questions by an argument designed to prove that the causes of the comparative apathy are ignorance of the encouraging results already attained, and, above all, too exclusive devotion to the prosecution of the Home Missions of Christianity—an exclusiveness which robs Foreign Missions of their due share of attention and support. The larger part of Dr. Mullens' work is expended in setting forth the general social effects of Christianity in the East, and in presenting a brilliant picture of the results to be expected in the future from the gradual undermining of heathenism. The chief practical object of his book is, apparently, to persuade the churches to make larger pecuniary contributions to the funds of the missionary societies, under the idea that a few hundreds of additional missionaries will hasten the conversion of Asia to the belief of the gospel.

For Dr. Mullens, as a laborious missionary and able director of mission work, it is impossible not to entertain warm regard and very sincere reverence. It is not, however, inconsistent with that regard to offer a few suggestions in the way of further an-

[1] Titus 2 : 12, 13.

swer to the questions proposed by him, as to the causes of that decline of interest in missions which he confesses and laments.

It is not necessary to deny the force of the allegation that the churches at home devote a disproportionate measure of attention to English objects. Men are naturally interested in the visible more than in the invisible, in England, which is seen, more than in India, which is unseen. The spiritual force which is required to sustain a deep and settled interest in the missions of the gospel is far greater than is usually supposed. They make a larger demand upon the spiritual nature of man than any other form of human endeavor. To feel compassion for the souls of nations whom we have never beheld, from whom we are divided by the diameter of the globe, who are physically and morally our antipodes, with whose natural character we have the faintest sympathy—to expend thought, effort, and considerable property in furthering the interest of those unknown nations in a world which is still more completely invisible and unknown, requires a depth of conviction, a strength of principle, an elevation of spirit wholly foreign to ordinary human nature, and neither to be produced nor sustained except by the direct action of the Spirit of God.

The same Power which alone can "thrust forth" a true laborer into the harvest, can alone create or uphold a corresponding spirit of zeal, faith, and self-sacrifice in the churches which send him forth. The missionary agency abroad is the hand at the end of a long arm, extended by the Church at home. If that arm is paralysed at the shoulder, whence shall come the force by which blows shall be struck at the ends of the earth? A decline of the spiritual life, therefore, in England, a decay of faith in things unseen, a loss of spiritual power through the advance of habits of luxurious living, would necessarily take the form, first of a loss of interest in the unseen field of foreign missions—a decline of interest soon to be followed by a similar decay in the work of God at home.

It is not my intention, however, to prosecute this line of inquiry. We shall proceed on the more agreeable hypothesis, that the concern for the salvation of the heathen nations is just as earnest and real as ever it was; and suggest a few considerations tending to explain the nature of those influences which have so greatly repressed of late years the exhibitions of interest in missionary societies in nearly all Christian communities.

UMI

I. And in the first place, I venture to assign as one cause of the indisputable decline of interest in the existing foreign missions of the gospel, *a growing scepticism as to the theory on which they are established.*

In the apostolic age the doctrinal spirit and the missionary spirit were evolved by the Spirit of God in the church with equal power, and they ought never to be separated. Each requires combination with the other.

It has unhappily happened several times since that each has been developed alone. In some ages a spirit of missions has been developed apart from the spirit of doctrinal study, as in the second and third, the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In other cases, the doctrinal spirit has been evolved without a corresponding activity of the spirit which leads to the diffusion of the gospel. At the close of the last century, when the existing Protestant missionary societies arose amidst the hurricanes of the French Revolution, the spirit of theological study, of careful, bold, devout, biblical criticism, on which the faith ought to be founded, was as nearly as possible defunct in England. Perhaps we may say that just at the very time when it became of more importance than ever that the church should take care what was to be taught as Christianity among the nations of the world, the work of evangelizing was commenced, as it had been in several similar preceding ages of activity in Christendom, in a spirit of unquestioning submission to the forms of thought and expression stereotyped by previous generations. Never was any great enterprise begun with more simplicity of purpose, with more heroic faith, with more devoted piety, than the enterprise of the founders of the Baptist, and Independent, and Episcopal Missions, at the close of the last century; and also, it must be added, never was any great enterprise begun with more unquestioning adhesion to the traditions of the fathers. There was scarcely a man among the whole company of persons engaged in that glorious undertaking who ever dreamed of doubting any of the doctrines stamped with the imprimatur of the sixteenth century Reformation. The powers of action awoke, as often before, in isolation, and the power of thought and truth-seeking still for the most part slumbered.

What has been the result of this phenomenon? Is it not this, that inasmuch as the theological spirit has since recovered its energy in the churches, and attention has been devoted once more to biblical criticism and doctrine, there is now a certain separation between the missions of Protestantism and the deeper home convictions of religious Englishmen. The Missionary Societies represent the thinking of seventy years ago, when the church accepted without question the traditions of Protestant theology handed down by the Reformers. But they are surrounded by a generation which has lifted the anchors of its theology, and which has drifted or sailed into other waters. In some of the most important particulars of Christian faith, indeed, there is no change. The faith in a divine Christ, in an atonement for sin, in the person and work of the Holy Spirit, in a gratuitous justification, is the same now as it was of old. But these doctrines were considered by the founders of missions as but a superstructure built on a deeper foundation. That foundation was an antecedent belief in the natural immortality of mankind, and their consequent destiny either to endless misery or endless joy. In the opinion of Dr. Carey, and those who first went with him to India, as well as of the churches in Britain, every human being was an immortal, was possessed of a soul as eternal in the future as the nature of God. Every inhabitant of India was thus regarded as an immortal. Every unregenerate soul, descended from Adam, was born under the curse of endless woe, and was, by its own sins, confirmed in that direful destiny. Salvation could be effected only by the distinguishing grace of God in regeneration. All the unregenerate of all ages were unsaved, and the unsaved of India, as of all lands, were destined to be delivered over, as Dr. Carey says in one of his letters, to "endless misery." To endless misery had gone all the numberless unregenerate inhabitants of Asia during the ages of darkness preceding the advent of Dr. Carey to India. To "endless misery" were going all the millions who rejected his message, or refused to abandon their ancestral creeds. This is still the foundation of missionary theology. This is still what may be called the State Creed of all the missionary societies. No one is considered at liberty to deny it in a missionary speech or sermon. It is the platform creed of Exeter Hall. The missionary students at the colleges are supposed to believe it. The directors are supposed to believe it. The missionaries abroad are supposed to believe it. No one who openly assailed it would be asked to assist at a missionary assembly, or to plead the cause of missions before the people.

UMI

And yet, it is disbelieved in the churches throughout the length and breadth of the country. It is doubted and denied with varying degrees of confidence. But it *is* doubted and denied almost universally; and most of all by persons of accurate knowledge and spiritual intelligence. The doubt and denial is not confined to sceptics, to mockers, to adversaries; but it is professed with more or less of openness by men whose knowledge gives the utmost weight to their judgment, and whose hardworking piety challenges comparison with that of any of the advocates of the older creed. One meets with a few earnest, and able, and unquestionably sincere, controversial supporters of that elder belief. The names of Dr. Pusey, of Dr. Salmon of Dublin, and of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, will occur to all readers. But no one who intimately knows English religious society will venture to deny that there has been an immense revolution in opinion as to the probable destiny of the ignorant idolatrous nations of the earth, and that it is the rarest thing to find even a secretary of a missionary society, or the tutor of a missionary college, who will, *when firmly pressed*, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to the opinions on this question of the founders of our missionary societies. Men, nowadays, have their doubts, their special theories of relief, their hopes, or their positive doctrines. Either they hold, as I am informed that some heads of colleges hold, that Scripture gives room for several opposite theories; or they lean to Universalism, and teach men to trust in future purgatories; or they wholly repudiate and openly denounce and assail the old missionary doctrine, and believe with us that they who have "sinned without law," and led impenitent lives under heathen doctrines, shall "perish without law," and "die" with "few stripes;" but it is simply a fact that opinion has changed and is changing here, and that the churches at home, acted upon by the revived spirit of doctrinal study, are silent where our fathers would have spoken, or doubt where they would have unhesitatingly followed the doctrine of the dark ages, or boldly deny where they would have awfully anathematized opposition. No one seems moved by the argument that such good men as our fathers were must have been right in all their doctrines. We know, as a matter of fact, that they were wholly mistaken in many things which they firmly believed. The truth is that Nature, and Scripture, and human life, are better understood than they were seventy years ago, and the conviction is widely spread that the ancient notion of the consignment to everlasting torment of the countless multitudes of the heathen who have been born in error, bred up in superstition, and who were abandoned to die either in total ignorance of the true gospel, or in rejection of a gospel message only partly revealed to them, *cannot possibly be true* under the government of Infinite Justice, Boundless Wisdom, and Eternal Love.

The general result is, that the religious public feel that the unchanged missionary theology does not, in some important respects, represent their present thoughts, and thence follows a decline of interest in the propagation of ideas no longer believed. Few men of the first class, in either honesty or ability, offer themselves for missionary work. It is understood that the studies of college life are not likely to lead always to the faith of our forefathers: hence, since open denial, or opposition, or avowed scepticism is forbidden, strong men shrink from a vocation in which integrity of thought and speech will become penal; and the missionary work is delivered over to persons of a more compliant and docile constitution—men also will continue to utter in the ears of the heathen the monstrous, unrealized propositions of a former day, or worse, who will keep silence about hell altogether.

I attribute, therefore, the decline of interest in missionary societies to an unconfessed partial destruction of the faith on which they were founded, and for the propagation of which they are maintained. Men feel coldly toward a system which sends out missionaries, whose training at home consists very much in persuading them *not to think* conclusively of the questions of human retribution and destiny; and which discourages the expression of belief, whether at home or abroad, in a sense accordant with the maturest thought of the English churches. The persuasion is universal, that the missions of the gospel ought to represent the results of England's most earnest studies. It is felt that they do not represent them. It is felt that this state of things ought to be altered—that there ought to be more space allowed both at college, and in the mission field, certainly for doubt, for undecided opinion, and even for open variation from the ancient creed—that there ought to be liberty for missionaries to express abroad, especially in their dealings with the educated men of India and China, ideas which are gaining ascendancy over the best minds at home. It is felt that the gov-

UMI

erning power of missions ought not to be exclusively in the hands of men who think on all subjects as our fathers did seventy years ago—or worse still, in the hands of men who only *pretend* to think as they did. It is felt that Jesuitism among Protestants is just as demoralizing as among Romanists; that what is needed in missionary work above all things is, not concealment of opinion, not hidden doubt, not a weak compliance with the articles insisted on by ignorant multitudes, but earnest, overwhelming faith, a faith which believes, and therefore speaks, a faith which can blow beside the walls of Jericho a "dolorous and jarring blast," before which the defences of heathenism will crumble to the ground. And until the realities of the future world occupy a far larger space in the thoughts of missionary Secretaries, and missionary Directors, the feeling of English churches toward them is not likely to improve. Meanwhile it may be noted as a symptom of the disorder complained of, that even Mr. Mullens' own book on missions, admirable man as he is, does not contain a single vigorous reference to heaven or hell; and that for aught that explicitly appears on his pages, replete with statistical information, the work of missions might almost be taken to refer to some movement for man's temporal salvation. A state of thought, which takes heaven and hell for granted, when treating on missions to the heathen, requires some reform.

II. Another reason for the decline of interest in missionary societies, will I think be found in *the failure of spiritual results.* This failure has sunk deeply into the heart of England. Public opinion has begun to form itself under other influences than missionary reports and missionary speeches. These tell but a portion of the truth. That which is favorable is generally published. That which is unfavorable is withheld. We are beginning to learn not only who are converted, but who are unconverted; not only what the missionaries think of the learned and able men of India and China, but what the learned men of China and India think of some things taught by the missionaries. We are learning to compare resources and results. We are learning to exercise imagination upon the missionary enterprise, and to understand how it must appear to the "natives" whose religions it assails.

For example, we now comprehend that the presence of our ing handful of European missionaries in the ports of China, bring-with them a "gospel," of which the fundamental doctrine is that all

former inhabitants of China, who have been atheists or idolaters; that is, the larger proportion of that stupendous population, during many ages, and who have died in an unregenerate condition, have gone to endless misery—strikes the educated men of China precisely as a similar message would strike the learned men of our Universities, if brought to England after ages of heathenism, by a handful of Chinese missionaries, landing in the ports of London and Liverpool. We can now understand that if it would be highly improbable that our literati would listen to so horrible a proclamation, or recognize in it the voice of a just and benevolent Deity, so it is equally improbable that it will appear Divine when taught by our missionaries at Pekin or Ningpo. And thus we come to comprehend at least some of the reasons, which, after seventy years of labor, the learned and educated classes of both India and China are as far as ever from embracing Christianity. Chinese clergymen, with a similar doctrine at London and Liverpool, could scarcely hope for greater success among ourselves.

Further, the public, after fully believing and appreciating the cheering declarations of our missionary writers as to the social revolution which is gradually advancing throughout the earth, the civilizing process which is supposed to augur a favorable future for Christianity—nevertheless have learned to study the reports of *known and actual conversion* with profound disquietude, and have settled into the opinion that there must be "some awful mistake somewhere," as Mrs. Stowe expresses it, in the ideas presented for acceptance to the multitudinous Orient. In India there are 180,000,000 of people. In China there are 400,000,000 more. Now all the confessed living converts to Christianity, in India, after seventy years of labor, by thirty-one missionary societies, are at this moment not much over 30,000, the far larger proportion of these being persons of the lowest rank in intelligence. Around these professed converts there is a *Christianized* population of a quarter of a million. We thank God for even such results. But it is impossible to forget what these figures mean. They mean that if you cause to pass before you all the inhabitants of India in ranks of thirty abreast, and marching a yard apart, you would have a column extending from the Land's End in Cornwall to the edge of the Caspian Sea, while the converts to Christianity would be represented by one thousand of these ranks of thirty. If the whole population

passed in single file before the eye, and three seconds were allowed to gaze with awful interest as to his eternal destiny upon each dusky countenance, it would require thirty years, of days of twelve hours each, to survey the whole. But the living nominal converts to Christianity from over the whole of India would pass, at the same rate of movement, in twenty-five hours. In China the known results of missionary action are even more appallingly small. You may, indeed, hope that there are thousands of Nicodemuses in both India and China, a hope at once reasonable and encouraging, and thousands more of men saved by the Spirit in their own twilights, but surely there is some apparent deficiency in the power of modern Christianity. Where is the arm that smote Rahab? Where is the power of truth and grace that smote the philosophies and idolatries of the Mediterranean in the apostolic age, and shook the whole of Europe and Asia in a single generation? Let it not be said, it was the force of miracles that then availed. Miracles exerted an inconsiderable influence in comparison with a truth which commended itself to all consciences, a grace that commended itself to all affections, and a terror which struck like a thunderbolt from the uplifted hand of the Almighty.

Is it not that we are propagating a Christianity which is half paralyzed in its two chief forces of hope and fear through the perversions of a corrupted theology? We fail in thoroughly presenting God's love to the nations, a love strong enough to melt even Chinese arrogance, and to develop the belief of a personal God even among Chinese atheists, because we have encumbered Christianity with a doctrine of hell, so unjust, so indiscriminate, so hardening in its frightful propositions, that men's consciences refuse to receive it. Missionary theology cannot "commend itself to every man's conscience," because every man's conscience, whether in Europe or Asia, in proportion as it is enlightened, rejects it with horror. This is doubtless one principal reason for the general rejection of the gospel by the Brahmins, Bhuddists, and Confucianists of the East. God's love is hidden from them, and they "turn away sorrowful" from so direful a Christianity. Sir John Bowring says, in his work on Siam, that he never yet met with a learned Bhuddist who could speak with patience of the doctrine of the missionaries on the hell of England and America. Now whatever the better sort of thinking

men of any nation generally reject, will not be widely received by the uneducated.

III. But the prevailing system of teaching among missionaries fails also in another department—fails through withholding the influence of a truth favorable to the production alike of hope and of fear. Not only does the hell preached by the missionaries fail by its unscriptural representations to awaken terror in the educated classes, since whatever you exaggerate you weaken, but it is nearly everywhere the custom with missionary societies to send out men opposed to the belief of Christ's advent to judge the nations at the destruction of the Apostasy. The plain doctrine of Paul, in the second letter to the Thessalonians, that the personal advent of Christ will occur for the purpose of destroying "the man of sin;" the plain doctrine of the prophets that the "Son of man comes in the clouds of heaven" for the destruction of the "fourth" empire, and of the "horn that has eyes, and a mouth speaking marvelous things;" the plain doctrine that Christ will come to punish "with flaming fire" a church that has perverted Christianity until men can no longer believe in it, and to judge nations that persist in idolatry after due summons to repentance—this doctrine of Christ's "pre-millennial" advent, under the influence and expectation of which the gospel was indisputably spread in the first century, is systematically exploded and denied by the missionary societies, and the generality of missionaries. And here is a loss of power which may be readily appreciated. Let the gospel be preached in India and China as the message of life to the dead, as the promise of immortality in body and soul to a race sitting in darkness and death shade; let it be preached as the message of a God who is intelligibly loving, and intelligibly and justly severe; let it be preached that the "times of ignorance a gracious God winked at," *overlooked*, "but now commands all men everywhere to repent; let the words of the angel of the everlasting gospel, in the Apocalypse, become the text of missionary preaching, "Fear God, and give glory to him, *for the hour of his judgment is come!*" and one cannot but believe that a new power will attend in the East the proclamation of Christianity. There is something so striking, so fitted to compel attention, in the warning of Christ's speedy advent to "judge the nations," to destroy obstinate worshipers of idols, to avenge the rejection of the truth, to raise the dead saints, and to establish

UMI

"God's kingdom" on earth, that even languid India must lift its head to listen, and haughty philosophic China must listen awe-struck to the trumpet-blast. Christianity is a power which is designed to operate on man from before as well as from behind, through the expectation of events which shortly "shall come to pass," in the future, as well as through the study of facts accomplished in a remote past. It is emphatically a prophecy, as well as a history. But, under the prevalent system of missionary teaching, it is a gospel without that advent of Christ, the prospect of which filled and reddened like a dawn of glory at the beginning all the eastern sky. The whole body of prophecy is supposed now to prove only that "the Lord delayeth his coming," that wisdom consists in proclaiming the doctrine of the "evil servant," and in relegating all concern for the Lord's return in the clouds of heaven to a generation that shall live at the end of the Millennium. Vain, then, are all such warnings as, "Behold, he cometh in clouds, and every eye shall see him!" for it is well understood that such an expectation of the Lord is peculiar to the "weaker brethren," and to spirits in which fancy takes the place of faith. Thus it happens that Christ's advent is banished from the thoughts of nearly the whole body of missionaries. "*Far off his coming shines*" to them, indeed, as a remote, dim nebula in the firmament of the future. Who can wonder that a Christianity so destitute of forces to win, to convince, or to appal, maintains a doubtful fight with the stiffnecked pagans of Asia! What is wanted is a doctrine that commends itself to the reason and to the conscience of men—a love so real as to win all hearts capable of love, a terror so real, so near, and so appreciably equitable, as to shake, if it cannot vanquish, the stoutest resistance of the heathen. What is needed, is a hope of speedy victory to the church sufficient to restore the energies of the first century, and a courage founded on conviction which would engage in close conflict with the wretched positivism of Confucius. That "throneless king," as the Chinese call him, would soon, I reckon, lose such of his remaining power, before a CHRIST preached as if he were the very Jesus of the Gospels —"coming again," to be the "life" of the world.

With all reverence and affection, therefore, but with an earnestness which neutralizes the remembrance of personal insignificance, I implore my fellow-Christians at home to reconsider in the light of Scripture the doctrinal basis and method of the missionary enterprise. I adjure, before Christ our Lord, the Secretaries and Directors of the Missionary Societies, not to continue the ban now disingenuously placed upon those who openly deny what so few in secret perfectly believe. I solemnly call upon all the ministers of Christ who are persuaded of the untruth of the common doctrine on immortality and retribution, publicly to say so, and to confess their real convictions to the people. I earnestly invite all missionary students in the colleges to study these questions in earnest, and not to add to the number of those who carry out to the heathen a creed which they dare not proclaim to the cultured and intelligent people of India and China.

And finally, if my voice could, by a divine providence, reach so far, I would call, with profound respect, but equal boldness, upon every honored missionary of the Cross around the world, to cast aside the fear of brethren abroad, or churches or directors at home, and to apply his mind, if he have failed so to do up to this present hour, to the consideration of that doctrine of LIFE IN CHRIST which is the plain and natural reading of St. John's Gospel, St. Paul's Epistles; and next, to that doctrine of Christ's ADVENT TO JUDGMENT, which has won the conviction, in modern times, of a Bengel, a Stier, and an Alford, and a thousand more, and was unquestionably the belief of the apostles and their followers in the first age of the Christian revelation.—*Rev. Edward White, in Rainbow for July*, 1869.

THE SECOND ADVENT—ITS NATURE—TIME—AND PRACTICAL BEARING.

"A more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed." (2 Pet. 1: 19.)
"This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.)
"All Scripture is profitable for righteousness." (2 Tim. 3: 16.)

Not only are the truths revealed in the Bible the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but they are designed for our spiritual good. It is through the truth that we are sanctified. Error is always injurious in its tendency. All Scripture is profitable. There is nothing contained in these divine oracles which may not be made available to our spiritual welfare. Some truths are of a more decidedly practical nature than others; but all are to be received and studied, that they may produce their legitimate results, in moulding moral character, and fitting us the better for duty here, and for the experience and enjoyment of what is

to be revealed hereafter. Mere speculation or conjecture can be of but little profit. Much time may be spent in endeavoring to unravel mysteries; much in striving to comprehend or discover what lies beyond the reach of our comprehension, or what is not properly within the range of our investigation, and which cannot be discovered, because it has not been revealed. All such time and effort are vainly expended. There is much in the future hidden from our view; and it is not for man to strive to penetrate, or to uplift the veil which shuts out from vision these unrevealed portions of God's wise and wondrous plan. Patiently must we wait for their revelation, as he shall unfold and develop his purposes, more and more clearly, for the admiration and blessedness of his Church. There are, however, things pertaining to the future, which the Lord has been pleased clearly to make known. Prophecy is a prominent feature of the Bible record, and it is given to us for our edification and study. Much of the prophetic Scriptures has already met with its literal fulfillment, and much remains yet to be fulfilled; while each day, as it passes by, presents us with predictions in the actual process of accomplishment.

Prophecy, already fulfilled, confirms our confidence in the truthfulness of the Scriptures and in the faithfulness of God. It is a standing proof of the truth of the religion of the Bible, which infidelity vainly strives to gainsay, or to successfully resist; and it is the assurance, moreover, that what remains unfulfilled will as certainly be verified. But is the study of unfulfilled prophecy a profitable study? Is it a subject of legitimate investigation? May we not be benefitted by what is already accomplished, and leave what is future without special inquiry or care, and especially so because of the conflicting views of professed interpreters in regard to many of these predictions? So some reason, and so some regulate their course, persuading themselves that the study of what is not fulfilled is not for edification or instruction. This is not, however, in accordance with the Spirit, or the teachings of the word of God; for *all* Scripture is not only given by inspiration, but is also "profitable."

The prophets, in former days, carefully studied the predictions they were bidden themselves to deliver. "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." (1 Pet. 1: 10, 11.) If they were thus employed, wishing to understand the import of their own words, surely the prayerful examination of what the Lord declares to be yet in reserve for the world and the Church is not only a duty but a privilege; inasmuch as scenes far more glorious and startling than have ever transpired on earth are before us, and it may be not far removed. A special blessing is pro-

PAGE(S) MISSING

UMI

nounced on those who make these coming events the subject of inquiry. The volume of inspiration closes with the most extended and intricate portion of the prophetic writings; and at the very opening of the "Revelation" we hear the inspired Apostle saying, as it were in anticipation of any objection to the study which might be raised, and for the encouragement of the inquirer: "*Blessed* is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand." (Rev. 1: 3.) Thus would the Spirit of the Lord lead us to examine those things of the future which have been made the subjects of revelation. It is to be done with a docile, prayerful, unprejudiced spirit, if we would secure the promised blessedness.

Prominent amid the subjects of inquiry is that of the SECOND COMING OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Our object is to consider it: (1) IN ITS NATURE; (2) IN ITS TIME; AND (3) IN ITS PRACTICAL BEARINGS.

I. AS TO ITS NATURE.

There is a spiritual coming of Christ spoken of in the Scriptures. Said the Savior, "If a man love me, my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." (John 14: 23.) "Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me." (Rev. 3: 20.) This is, unquestionably, a spiritual coming, and it is one in which every regenerated soul has a special interest. So may there be said to be a *providential* coming of Jesus. Every providence that affects our weal or woe—every startling incident of life may, in a sense, be said to be the coming of him whose ordering it is. So the solemn warning to the church at Sardis; "If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." (Rev. 3: 3.) But these, the spiritual and providential comings of Christ, are not what are meant by the emphatic and repeated assurances of the "coming of the Son of man."

The prophets of old, in glorious strains, spoke of the advent of the Messiah—Israel's Prince and Deliverer. And ardent were the anticipations which these animating predictions awakened. The character of the predicted one was twofold. He was described by Isaiah as a suffering victim of bitter persecution—"a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; despised and rejected of men." He was also described as a ruling Prince, a gloriously exalted King upon his throne, whose kingdom should extend over the earth, and whose dominion should know no end. There was to be given unto him, as Daniel declares, "dominion, glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Thus the range of the prophet's vision em-

braced more than the advent of Christ eighteen hundred years since, when as the helpless babe, at Bethlehem, he appeared the incarnate One who came on his mission of mercy to our perishing race; and when, as man's atoning sacrifice, he hung, a murdered Nazarene, upon the cross. This was his state of humiliation and of suffering; and was the verification of only a part of the prediction. That prediction extended onward for many centuries, and embraced a *second* coming, when should be realized the visions of a glorious Prince in possession of a dominion and a kingdom over all people, and nations, and languages—a dominion that was to be everlasting, and a kingdom "without end." The prophecy had respect to a reigning Prince, as well as to a suffering victim. As one part of the prediction did not mean a spiritual coming, but a personal, literal advent to suffer and to die, so neither does the other—or that yet waiting its fulfillment, which regards him as a ruling Prince on earth—admit of a spiritual or figurative interpretation. It is to be a visible, personal advent, as certainly as was that when eastern Magi offered their gifts in the lowly abode at Bethlehem; or when the diseased and demon-possessed of Jerusalem knew his healing power; or when scoffing priests reviled the sufferer on the cross; or when wondering disciples saw him pass from their vision, as they gazed up from Olivet into the opened heavens. "This same Jesus which is taken from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." So spake the angels to the disciples, and their words will assuredly be verified. He was *seen* to go into heaven, and so will he be *seen* to come again. "This *same* Jesus;" and in *like manner* as he *went* will he *return*. Here can be nothing less than a personal, visible advent. Nor are the words to wait for their literal fulfillment until the Millennium be passed.

It may be a matter of some interest to note the *manner* in which the Scriptures are wont to speak of the second advent of Christ. This will give us additional proof that such advent cannot be a spiritual or a figurative coming. This coming is represented by at least twelve different words or expressions, and these occur about one hundred and twenty-five times in undoubted reference to this great event. The import of three of these words would seem to settle the question touching the nature of the advent of the Redeemer. The first is a word which gives the title to the last book of the Scriptures, "The Revelation," sometimes called the Apocalypse of Christ—the Greek word *apokalupsis*, meaning revelation or manifestation. "The Revelation of Jesus Christ" is the beginning and the title of the book, because his personal coming, the revelation or manifestation of himself, is its grand, prominent subject.[1] The word occurs in 1 Cor. 1: 7, "waiting for the coming [the revelation, as the original is] of Jesus Christ." "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from

[1] W. Newton.

heaven." (2 Thess. 1: 7.) "At the appearing [revelation] of Jesus Christ." "Hope for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." (1 Pet. 1: 7, 13.) A second word is *epiphania*, and means appearance—personal appearance. It occurs in 2 Tim. 1: 10, in reference to the first coming of our Lord in the flesh, and in 1 Tim. 6: 14, to his second coming, "until the appearing [*epiphania*] of our Lord Jesus Christ." "Who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom," "unto all them that love his *appearing*." (2 Tim. 4: 1, 8.) "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious *appearing* of the Great God and (even) of our Savior Jesus Christ." (Tit. 2: 13.) The third word used is *parousia*, which embraces always the idea of personal presence, "arrival." (Donnegan.) It is found four times in Matt. 24, in reference to the second advent of Christ. "What shall be the sign of thy *coming* [*parousia*]?" "So shall the *coming* [*parousia*] of the Son of man be." "As the days of Noah were, so shall the *coming* [*parousia*] of the Son of man be." St. Paul thus uses the word: "They that are Christ's at his *coming*." (1 Cor. 15: 23.) "Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his *coming*." (1 Thess. 2: 19.) "At the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." (1 Thess. 3: 13.) "We which are alive and remain unto the *coming* of the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 15.) Such are some of the passages where these words are used. In other places we find them in reference to *other* objects or persons, but never to denote a spiritual or figurative revelation or appearance or advent or presence. Always where it is an object of sense, a literal, personal, visible appearance is meant.

Thus nothing, surely, is more clearly revealed than the visible second coming of the Son of man to this very earth. On almost any page of the Bible is there reference, more or less direct, to it. It runs through the New Testament, as a golden thread, giving significancy and interest to every part, as it falls from the lips of the divine teacher, or as it is spread out upon the pages of the epistles of the inspired apostles to the several Churches they addressed.

II. But, WHAT IS TO BE THE TIME OF HIS ADVENT? This is our *second* inquiry.

In the second epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, mention is made of "the man of sin," or the "anti-Christ," whose destruction is to be effected by the "brightness of the Lord's coming." It so happens that the *brightness* and the *coming* of this passage are, in the original, two of the words just referred to, each of which expresses the *personal appearance* of him whose coming is spoken of. If neither of them when used singly can denote a spiritual advent, much less can they when conjoined; and if each of these, when employed separately, indubitably, means a *personal* and *corporeal* manifestation and presence, much more must they when united. The destruction of anti-Christ then is

not to be a spiritual destruction, nor to be accomplished by any mere spiritual manifestation of his Destroyer. But his is to be a literal overthrow, effected by the brightness of the coming, or by the "appearance of the presence" of the Son of God in judgment on his enemies. There is also mention made in the same place of the "mystery of iniquity," which was already working at the time Paul wrote his epistle. This "mystery," having its rudiments even in apostolic times, became under the development of subsequent ages, in its full manifestation, the formidable despotism which overshadowed Christendom, and was known as the all-controlling power whose seat was on the seven hills. It was the "scarlet-clad woman," "the mother of abominations," the Romish hierarchy. Now are "anti-Christ," the formidable "man of sin," and this power, impiously assuming the name of Christianity and the prerogatives of Christ—this gigantic evil—this grand antagonistic system of Satanic origin—to continue, as we have inquired once before, through the Millennium, and onward to a distant period—then to be destroyed at the predicted advent of the Lord Jesus, as he comes to judgment and to a world's annihilation? If not, then must that advent be before the Millennium. Both are to be destroyed at the "revelation" of the Son of God.

The same truth is revealed in the seventh of Daniel We are, moreover, taught, as has already been seen, that Satan is the "god of this world," or the god of this period (*aion*)—or present dispensation; and here will he continue, by divine permission, to have the pre-eminence until the time shall have come for his being bound and cast into the abyss, previous to which the tares and the wheat are to remain intermingled, until the "harvest," which is the end of the world (*aion*)—the present dispensation or age, and then the Son of man shall come to make the grand separation, and to destroy the wicked, and to establish his kingdom. The Gospel of the kingdom is to be preached "for *a witness* unto all nations," in order that the Lord may take *out of them*—or out from among them—his elect people—"a people for his name;" and that every nation may have an opportunity to say whether or not they will yield to the dominion of the Prince of righteousness.

Thus is the present period a period of suspended judgments—one of forbearance toward the guilty nations of the earth. But when the angel, bearing the everlasting Gospel, shall have accomplished his circuit of the globe, the time of forbearance shall cease—"the end shall come." "And *then* shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and *they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven*, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt. 24: 30, 31.)

But the question as to the TIME OF THE SECOND ADVENT admits of, and seems to demand, a more definite answer; and we may consider, (1) *The relative period;* (2) *The specific or chronological time.*

Whatever may be thought and said by some of the presumption of those who venture to specify a particular "hour or day," or even year, wherein the Lord shall appear, we are, assuredly, warranted, yea, it is our enjoined *duty* so to consider the "signs" of his coming as at least to judge of our *proximate* nearness to the event; else the injunction is without meaning. "When these things [these signs just enumerated by the Savior] begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your *redemption draweth nigh.*" (Luke 21: 28.)

Various "signs" are specified, by which we are to judge of the near approach of the predicted period. And, if careful observers and attentive students are not greatly at fault in their calculations, based on these "signs," the time is near at hand, when a heedless world and a slumbering Church will be startled from their apathy by the cry: "*Behold! the Bridegroom cometh. Go ye out to meet him.*" We are taught that these "signs" will be so clear a demonstration of the immediate coming and kingdom of Christ, that we can know his coming is at hand, just as we know that summer is nigh when the trees begin to put forth leaves. (Luke 21: 30; Matt. 24: 33.) We are not only taught to believe that we *can* know it, but we are as positively commanded to know it as we are to believe that Jesus is the Son of God. (Matt. 24: 33; Mark 13: 29; Luke 21: 28, 31.) Among these "signs" immediately to precede this glorious event—the coming of our Lord—and by which we are to judge of its proximate nearness are:

1. *The Gospel is to be preached to all nations of the earth* "FOR A WITNESS." "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (Matt. 24: 14; Acts 1: 8.)

2. *A general apostasy from the faith in nominal Christendom.* "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" (Luke 18: 8; 2 Thess. 2: 3; 2 Tim. 3: 1, 5; 4: 3, 4, &c.)

3. *A great prevalence of iniquity in the world.* "As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Matt. 24: 37; 2 Thess. 2: 11; 2 Tim. 3: 13; Jude 17–19, &c.)

4. *National and political revolutions and great disturbances.* "There shall be upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and waves thereof roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory." (Luke 21: 25–27; Heb. 12: 27; Rev. 8: 1–13; Is. 2: 10–22, &c.)

5. *Numerous unusual physical phenomena, and portentous forebodings of nature.* "Great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and famines and pestilences; and fearful sights and great signs shall there be from heaven. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon earth distress of nations. And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud." (Luke 21: 11, 25, 27; Acts 2: 19, 20; Mic. 7: 15, 16.)

6. *An unusual awakening of interest and inquiry among the true followers of Christ respecting his second coming.* "At midnight there was a cry made. Behold, the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him." (Matt. 25: 6; Hab. 2: 1–3; Dan. 12: 4, 9.)

7. *Unprecedented manifestations of the power and malice of the devil in the Church and in the world.* "The devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." (Rev. 12: 12; Matt. 24: 24; 2 Thess. 2: 8, 12; 1 Tim. 4: 1, 3, &c.)

These and other signs are clearly indicated, and if we fail to look out for them, and to be influenced by them in our conclusions as to the approaching nearness of the grand event which they are designed immediately to anticipate, may we not meet with the displeasure of our Lord, and render ourselves obnoxious to the rebuke he administered to some of old: "O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" (Matt. 16: 3.)

But this opinion of the rapidly approaching period is not founded solely on "the signs" predicted; which leads us briefly to consider,

The specific (chronological) time of the Second Advent.

There are certain chronological predictions which have direct reference to this event; and which have not, surely, been given in order merely to awaken a curiosity never to be gratified, and to lead to vain and profitless speculation. If in ages past no satisfactory solution of these predicted times has been reached, *it is but the fulfillment of prophecy.* A celestial messenger said to Daniel (ch. 10: 14), "I am come to make thee understand what shall *befall thy people in the latter days.*" In the twelfth chapter we read, "O Daniel, *shut up* the words and *seal the book even to the time of the end.*" And again: "Then said I, O my Lord! what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are closed up and sealed *till the time of the end*.....And none of the wicked shall understand, *but the wise shall understand.*" Thus are we informed that a time would come when, howsoever obscure and unintelligible to the wicked these predictions should be, "*the wise should understand them*;" for "at the time of the end" are these seals to be broken and the words understood. And we ask, Who will say that the "time of the end" may not now have come? Within these thirty or forty years much attention has been given to the investigation of

these "signs" of the times, and to the study of the chronological prophecies, and these investigations have been conducted by some of the most sober-minded, the most learned, and the most godly of the Church; and it is a very noteworthy fact that, with scarcely a single exception, the conclusion is reached, that within a few years, three, or five, or ten, these predicted events will transpire, or begin to be verified. All the lines of prophetic interpretation, the result of independent and of varied methods of investigation, seem most remarkably to converge to these very years now just at hand. It is thought, and with many it is a conviction, that within the period specified, the long anticipated second coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, to glorify the saints, and to be glorified of them; to execute judgments upon his enemies; to establish his kingdom, will occur, or, at least, that "the beginning of the end" will be most manifest. In reference to any specific, definite time when these events will transpire, we wish to speak with caution. We have no opinion to express as the result of independent examination of the chronological prophecies. We refer to the conclusion which others have reached. A short time will test the correctness of these conclusions. They may prove fallacious. But those who entertain them think they have, after patient study, all-sufficient reasons for their belief. We do not give here the data on which their conclusions are founded, nor the varied investigations leading to them, but the simple result to which they have come, and this assuredly demands most serious consideration. For if it be legitimately reached, we are indeed standing on the very verge of that tremendous crisis, in which all the prophecies center in regard to the interests and the destinies both of the Church of God, and the nations of the earth, at the time of the great "harvest," at the end of the world, or the "times of the Gentiles."

We know that all attempts to fix definitely the time of these stupendous events is by many most strenuously opposed, and it is thought that there is decided scriptural warrant for the objection. Many of those who make it have no expectation of a literal kingdom with Christ, in person, the reigning Prince, *ever* being established here on earth. We have already noticed the intimation given to Daniel, that at "the time of the end" the seal of the book containing these mysteries should be broken, and the "wise should understand." We may now refer to some declarations of the Savior, which to many are the assurance that the time is not to be known by any until the event shall be actually upon us.

Jesus said to the inquiry of the disciples, "Wilt thou *at this time* restore again the kingdom to Israel?" "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." (Acts 1: 6, 7.)

It is of some importance here to note, that so far from this

UMI

response being a denial of his purpose to establish that kingdom which they expected would be here on earth, with him as their Prince, it is a virtual admission that *it would be so established.* The Savior would only remind them that it was not for *them* to know the *time* when it should be done. It is not for *you* to know—*you* of this generation, and it may have embraced many subsequent generations. It was in the *Father's power.* But if *they* were not to know the time, it does not follow that a knowledge of that time was always to be withheld from prayerful inquirers. It was in the Father's power not only to establish the kingdom, but to make known, if so he should be pleased to do, the time when it should be done; and especially as the period should arrive when, according to Daniel, "the wise would be made to understand" the contents of the sealed book; and when the "signs" of the times should clearly indicate the near approach of the great event. We see not that the response of the Savior is to bar or to discourage inquiry on the subject.

A second passage, which to some appears to be even more conclusive, as to the futility and impropriety of endeavoring to ascertain the time of the second advent, is the declaration of Jesus to his disciples as recorded, Mark 13:32: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Not designing to make a special point of the fact that reference is here made not to the *year*, but to the *day* and *hour* of his coming, it is yet worthy of some note, inasmuch as the specific day and hour are not embraced in the calculation of any. But even if they were, we see not that this utterance of the Savior forbids the hope of ascertaining them, much less does it prohibit positively or by implication an endeavor by the study of chronological prophecy to discover what may be the *year*, proximately at least. Jesus declares that neither man nor angel, nor the Son of man "*knoweth*" the day and hour. And the truthfulness of the declaration no one may question. But who is the Son of man, and what is the date, and what were the circumstances of the utterance? The Son is the same one precisely, of whom it is said, he "*increased* in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man." (Luke 2:52.) The same one who was, undoubtedly, in ignorance of some things, and it may be even of the time of his second coming, until the hour of his death. Christ was possessed of a twofold nature. How the human nature of Christ, in intimate union and sympathy with the divine, thus closely associated with Omniscience itself, could be limited in its knowledge, is not for us to explain. It is a mystery which we believe neither the writer nor the reader may comprehend. Still, it is a fact, beyond question, that of some things, Christ, when in the flesh, was absolutely ignorant. Of the time of his predicted advent he was, when he spoke the words, as ignorant as was man or angel. But was he always to remain in ignorance of that time? Can

he be ignorant of it as we write the sentence, or as the reader's eye may rest upon it? No one surely will affirm that now, as events are drawing to a crisis; now that the God-man is ordering his providences for the grand consummation, he knoweth not the time. "No man *knoweth.*" This was said eighteen hundred years since. This was then the state of knowledge on the subject. If the Son now knows the time, may not angels have learned it also? Has it not yet been revealed to those who are so intimately associated with that second coming? The Son of man is to come with "the holy angels." Are they yet to be apprised of this fact or of its nearness of approach, yea, of its definite period? While to these inquiries no absolutely positive answer may be given, it is, we affirm, a probability, approaching closely to a certainty, that it is a matter of absolute knowledge. And although "man" knew it not in the days of Christ's sojourn on earth, may he not learn it before the very time shall arrive, "lest that day come upon him unawares?" (Luke 21:34.) For an answer, we refer again to the command to Daniel to seal up the prophecy "even to the time of the end," and the subsequent assurance that the seals should be broken and "the wise should understand" (Dan. 12:4, 10); and to the testimony of Paul, who declares that "the children of light are not in darkness that the day should overtake them as a thief." (1 Thess. 5:4, 5.) The great reformer may not have been very presumptuous in his belief that "God would raise up some one who should be able to reckon up the times, and with certainty hit upon the very day."[1]

Is there, we ask, anything in the word of God to forbid our hope and expectation that the Lord will, if he has not already done it, imbue some diligent students with "wisdom," so that at this "time of the end" they may "understand" the import of these predictions?

Nor may we be at a loss to discover why it was that the definite time was not made known to the immediate disciples of Christ, and why it was withheld from many subsequent generations. The wisdom and the goodness of God are manifest in this divine arrangement. "I find in this concealment," remarks Dr. Seiss,[2] "the great unsearchable wisdom of the Author of salvation, in so arranging what he has said about the time as to secure the *same practical effects* for every age, without confining the promise to any." And Bickersteth[3] remarks, in answer to the question, "Why did he withhold the time?" "Look back. You stand on the eminence of eighteen centuries. See what these centuries have been. Generation after generation, apostles, martyrs, fathers, confessors, and reformers have lived and died. Mark all the conflicts through which the early Christians at-

[1] Luther; see Dr. Seiss' *Last Times*, p. 360.
[2] *The Ten Virgins*, p. 30.
[3] *Time to Favor Zion.*

tained their triumphs, their labors, sufferings, persecutions, and martyrdoms. Go on to the rise of Popery and Mohammedanism; see the dark ages; mark the struggles of infant Protestantism, and its subsequent decay. Look at the present spread of infidelity among professedly Christian nations. Had the apostles been told all this must previously take place—all this corruption must spread over the world—what needless despondency and heart-sinkings must have overwhelmed them! Eighteen hundred years of deferred expectation—eighteen hundred years yet to remain of the Gentile monarchies—and eighteen hundred years of the treading under foot of Jerusalem! With that wisdom and love which marks all the Lord's providence to his Church, this dark scene was kept back." Thus we see the wisdom and goodness of the Savior's answer to the questioning disciples: "It is not for *you* to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." He would have his people in every age reap the spiritual benefit of a cherished expectation of his coming. The animating, purifying, and heavenly hope of that event he would have them ever enjoy. Hence, they were to watch for it; to anticipate it; to rejoice in it. There was to be a season of waiting. A knowlege of how long it was to be protracted he kindly withheld from them; that thus they might feel the power and influence of his oft-repeated injunction, "Watch; for ye know not when the Son of man cometh."

But it still may be asked, as it often has been: "Wherefore dwell on these unfulfilled predictions? What profit are we to derive from the study of them?" Much every way, is the unhesitating reply of those who wait for and love Christ's appearing, as did the aged Paul when he anticipated the crown of righteousness, which he was to receive at the coming of his Lord.

We may now consider briefly—

III. THE PRACTICAL MORAL BEARING AND INFLUENCE OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

If this doctrine of the personal coming of Christ before the Millenninm be true; if this advent is (as we believe the Scriptures declare) to be preceded by, attended with, and followed by most stupendous events; if the Son of man is to come to raise from their graves the bodies of his saints, constituting "the first resurrection," "the resurrection of the just;" and if living believers, who shall be waiting for his coming, at the time, are to be caught up to meet him in the air; if he is subsequently to appear in glory "with all his saints," visible to every eye, to take vengeance on his enemies, and to renovate this earth, purifying it by fire, and making it the fit abiding-place of his ransomed ones; if he will thus, at his coming, establish his kingdom in righteousness, and here personally reign with his risen saints; and if we are to watch for this advent as for that which may occur at any time; then, surely, all will admit that the doctrine *should* have a direct salutary moral influence upon our lives and our feelings. It *should* operate most decidedly to make us more holy in conversation and more heavenly-minded. It should stimulate to the cultivation of every Christian grace. If with any who profess to embrace the doctrine, it does not bring forth these fruits of godliness, the reason must be looked for in other causes than the tendency of the belief. It is the testimony of those who *fully, without wavering or doubt*, receive this as the revelation of our Lord, that in their own experience there are realized powerful incentives to holy living—that they may be ready, with lamps trimmed and burning, and with oil in their vessels, to enter into the marriage feast, when the Bridegroom, for whose coming they are looking and praying, shall make his appearance. "For myself," remarks Ryle, "I can only give my own individual testimony; but the little I know, experimentally, of the doctrine of Christ's second coming, makes me regard it as most practical and precious, and makes me long to see it more generally received. I find it a powerful spring and stimulus to holy living; a motive for patience, for moderation, for spiritual-mindedness; a test for the improvement of time, and a guage for all my actions."

This result is just what the whole tenor of the word of truth would lead us to expect. If attention has not been particularly drawn to the subject, it will, perhaps, be a matter of surprise to find that the prominent, we had almost said exclusive, motive to repentence, and to Christian diligence, and heavenly-mindedness and holiness of life, as urged in the Scriptures, is this very fact, the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. If other considerations are presented, this stands pre-eminent as the one incentive and stimulus to duty. DEATH is that to which attention, in our day, is mainly directed as a motive to prepare for future retribution. It is certainly well calculated to arouse the attention of those who have but a brief probation here to spend. Death is the sealing of the destiny of the soul, as there is no further opportunity for repentance; and yet it is a fact well deserving serious reflection, that very seldom is any allusion made to death by the Savior, in his discourses, or by the apostles in their letters. We cannot recall a solitary instance where the sinner is exhorted to repentance, or the believer to diligence and holiness, in view of this event, so certain to all, so uncertain as to the time of its occurrence, and so momentous in its immediate and in its ever-continuing consequences. It is not the motive urged home upon the conscience as a stimulus to effort. We do not mean to say that this may not be presented as a consideration well calculated of itself to make a deep impression. What we desire, particularly, to enforce is, that it is not *the* Scriptural motive—that which the Holy Spirit has presented as pre-eminently the most effective. In every epistle, except the brief

ones, the second and third of John, and that to Philemon, there are allusions—and in several, very many allusions—to the second coming of Christ, as a motive to a holy life; whereas, not one solitary reference, it is believed, is to be found to death as an incentive to the impenitent, or a stimulus to the believer. And, furthermore, it is worthy of note that the uniform testimony of the ministers of Christ is that there is scarcely a subject, if there be one, which is urged upon the attention of their hearers with so little *permanent* benefit as death. For upwards of thirty years has the writer preached the Gospel, and has sought for motives to urge the sinner to forsake his sins, and the Christian to increased devotedness; and many have been his appeals, at funerals and upon other occasions, based on the certainty of death, its solemnities and results, and he is constrained to declare that, so far as memory serves him, in but two solitary cases, and these doubtful ones, has he had evidence of any lasting benefit as the result of these appeals. Now, why is it so? Death, wherever it occurs, makes a present solemn impression, awakens serious thought, and sometimes urges to resolutions of amendment. But where are to be found the *permanent* good results? They are confessedly but few. Do not men cooly discuss their plans of business and of pleasure even as they follow the corpse to the tomb? yea, often indulge in levity of feeling, and in the most trifling conversation? Why is it that these solemn admonitions, on the doings of death and in the very presence of the destroyer, so very generally fail to secure any abiding impressions for good? Why are our exhortations, and our warnings, in view of the opened grave, so barren of results? Can we find an all-sufficient, satisfactory answer in the thought, that the frequency of the occurrence so familiarizes the mind to the scene that susceptibility to salutary impressions is entirely or almost wholly lost? We think not. This may have, and undoubtedly has, its effect; but a solution of the question we must find in the fact that, agreeably to the Divine arrangement, as made known in the Scripture, death is not the subject of appeal. Everywhere it is the second coming of our Lord.

But it may be inquired, as it has often been, is not death to him who experiences it, to all intents and purposes, the same as the advent of Christ? And may we not understand by the expression, "The coming of the Son of man," where it is presented as a motive for watchfulness, this very providence? To both inquiries we are constrained to give an emphatic negative. Death and the coming of Christ are, in the Scriptures, widely contrasted. Death is the coming of the "king of terrors." It is a positive evil in itself, the result of Adam's apostasy. True, to the believer, it is, by the mercy of God, shorn of its terrors, and made a "gain;" only so, however, because of what sin hath brought upon our blighted earth. A "gain" only because we live in a world laboring under the curse; where life is a probation, a

discipline; and where no direct communion with him who is the believer's hope, and joy, and blessedness is had, except by faith. Death is, of itself, a positive evil; whereas, the coming of the Son of man is represented as a glorious event. Nowhere is death presented as the object of watchfulness, and by no legitimate reasoning can we substitute the "coming of the Son of man" for it. The exhortation to "watch for the coming of the Son of man" embraces much more than to watch for the approach of death. The mind is to be fixed on the stupendous, startling scenes which are connected with the second advent; and which are so intimately related, not only to the interests of individuals, but to those of the whole Church, and to the destinies of all nations. Read the comforting assurance of the Savior to his sorrowing disciples: "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you"—what then? Is it "I will come to you at death that you may enjoy it?" Ah, no! "I will *come again* and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also;" referring them to his predicted second advent, as the time when this blessedness would be fully realized.

Nothing is more obvious than the marked prominence given in the New Testament to the practical moral bearing of the doctrine of the second advent.

Professor Hackett, of the Newton Theological Seminary (who is not a Millennarian), a candid and distinguished commentator on the Acts of the Apostles, bears this testimony (p. 80):

> "The final coming of Christ was the great consummation on which the strongest desires of the souls of the first believers were fixed, and to which their thoughts and hopes were habitually turned. They lived with reference to this event. They labored to be prepared for it. They were constantly, in the expressive language of Peter, looking for and (in their impatience, as it were) hastening the arrival of the day of God. . . . . The apostles, as well as the first Christians in general, comprehended the grandeur of that occasion. It filled their circle of view; stood forth, to their contemplation, as the point of culminating interest in their own and the world's history; threw into comparative insignificance the present time, death, all intermediate events, and made them feel that the manifestation of Christ with its consequences of indescribable moment to all true believers, was the grand object which they were to keep in view as the end of their toils, the commencement and perfection of their glorious immortality. In such a state of intimate sympathy with an event, so familiar to their thoughts, they derived, and must have derived, their chief incentives to action from the prospect of that future glory. As we should expect, they hold it up to the people of God to encourage them in affliction, to awaken them to fidelity, zeal, and perseverance; and on the other hand, appeal to it to *warn the wicked and impress upon them the necessity of preparation for the revelations of that day*. If modern Christians," he continues to say, "sympathized more fully with the the sacred writers on this subject, it would bring both their conduct and their style of religious instruction into nearer correspondence with the lives and teaching of the primitive examples of our faith."

This emphatic statement is fully confirmed by a reference to

the Scriptures themselves. A few passages in illustration may be presented.

As an appeal to ministerial fidelity and diligence, hear Paul to Timothy:

"I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, *at his appearing and his kingdom*, preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine." (2 Tim. 4:1, 2.)

So Peter:

"The elders which are among you I exhort, ... feed the flock of God, ... and when *the Chief Shepherd shall appear* ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." (1 Pet. 5:2, 4.)

Are careless sinners to be aroused?

"What is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul; or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." (Matt. 16:26, 27.)

"Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when he shall come in his glory." (Luke 9:26.)

Are men called to repentance?

"Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ . . . . whom the heavens must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things." (Acts 3:19, 21.)

Are saints exhorted to holiness of life and spirituality of mind?

"When Christ who is our life *shall appear*, then shall ye also appear with him in glory. Mortify, *therefore*, your members which are upon the earth. (Col. 3:4, 5.)

"Denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ. (Tit. 2:12, 18.)

"And now, little children, abide in him: that *when he shall appear*, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him *at his coming*." (1 John 2:28.)

Are patience, forbearance, and long-suffering under persecutions and trials enjoined?

"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled, rest with us; when the Lord Jesus Christ shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, ... when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." (2 Thess. 1:6, 10.)

"Be patient, therefore, unto the coming of the Lord . . . . Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (Jas. 5:7, 8.)

Is the advanced pilgrim to be cheered with the prospect before him?

"I am now ready to be offered and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight. I have finished my course. I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord the righteous Judge shall give me *at that day*; and not to me only but unto all them also that *love* his appearing." (2 Tim. 4:6, 8.)

Such are specimens of the many instances where the practical efficiency of this doctrine is presented. It stands forth in the word of God, unequalled in its power to arouse the careless, to comfort the mourner, to incite to holiness of life, and to exalt the Savior and his cross.—*Selected.*

EDITORIAL.

We are happy to announce that The Quarterly has already received a list of subscribers sufficiently large to insure its permanent publication; though we do not yet feel justified in making the proposed enlargement of twenty pages. We are grateful for the hearty welcome it has received from every quarter; for we have received words of encouragement to the Editor, accompanied with flattering enconiums of the writers in the first Number, from the shores of the Pacific, from the Southern, Western, and Eastern States, and, also, from England.

Our enterprize was announced upon the faith of a few, who believed such a magazine would be sustained because *it was needed*. The result has justified their expectation. We present our second Number with the hope it may fully meet the expectations formed by its predecessor.

Having had the privilege of reading the manuscript of a new work entitled *The Doctrine of Immortality*, by Eld. James H. Whitmore, we have no hesitation in pronouncing it the finest thing ever written upon that subject. It is a carefully matured and finished work. Not so learned as Prof. Hudson's books, but quite as convincing, if not more so. It is, in short, a lucid, perspicuous, and complete view of the so-called life and death question. The work will be issued by the Western Association. The table of contents (we quote the heads of the chapters) is as follows: "Heathen Belief;" "Jewish Belief;" "Early Christian and Mediæval Doctrine;" "The Argument from Reason;" "The Argument from Scripture;" "The Lesson of Creation;" "The Adamic Penalty;" "Traduction *vs.* Creationism;" "General Testimony of Scripture;" "Life and Death;" "The Intermediate State;" "The Christian Redemption."

We assure our readers of a rich feast in this work. It will do much toward convicting our opponents who will read; and confirming in the faith the many who are still oppressed with doubts.

By way of experiment, we sent our initial number to several secular and orthodox journals, to see what notice it would elicit from them. One simply gave the list of contents; several added a few contemptuous words concerning *the ability* manifested in its pages; the rest took no notice of it. However, we succeeded in pleasing the class for whom The Quarterly was designed; hence, we do not feel at all hurt by the coolness of its reception among those whose best wish for it would naturally be that it might speedily expire.

In the New Testament, the second advent of our Savior is like a central sun, holding all other truths in their proper orbit. It is presented as the world's crisis; as the pivot on which time swings into eternity. Here faith ends in sight; hope is lost in realization; all the appliances of the strictly temporal are forever laid aside, and only the things which cannot be shaken continue on. Even inanimate creation, as realizing the glorious results of the changes then to be wrought in our world, is presented as groaning and travailing in pain while waiting in earnest expectation for the full revelation of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The New Testament Church seems fallen in love with a *personal* Savior, and never tires of reiterating in varied form his parting promise to *come again*. It is not only to them a blessed hope, but it is their only hope. If they indulged any other (save hopes distinctly stated to be subsidiary to this), they failed to record it.

What a different relation this hope of the return of a personal Savior occupies in most of the modern systems of theology claiming the New Testament as their basis! Instead of a central sun, it is mere nebula, often quite invisible, even to the telescope of faith, and without any obvious relations in their systems. Its time, objects, and manner are so indefinite and uncertain as to subject one who is disposed to thoroughly investigate them to the suspicion of being a meddler in the secret things declared to belong to the Almighty.

The facts against immaterialism are seldom more tersely stated than in the following paragraph, setting forth the position of that world-renowned writer, the Duke of Argyll:

"Nor in the intangible phenomena of mind is the chain of cause and effect broken. If the blood ceases to circulate, or the chest to heave, in an instant all our thoughts perish. Prolonged intellectual exercise produces bodily exhaustion, showing that mind and body are inseparably connected. To go more into detail, from the reptile to man an ascending scale of mental capacity is coincident with an ascending degree of cerebral organization; and many of the peculiarities of intelligence and disposition may be read in the features and shape of the head. Moreover, every physician knows that from a change in the substance and structure of the brain, the pure may become impure; the loving, malignant; the thoughtful imbecile; or the whole man may live for years without consciousness and without emotion. No series of facts can be more complete or more conclusive than that which tends to establish the truth that the brain—a compound of water, fat, albumen, and phosphates—generates thought."

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—JANUARY, 1870.—NO. III.

THE GOSPEL PREACHED TO ABRAHAM.

"And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." (Gal. 3: 8.)

The epistle of Paul to the Galatians, which contains the subject of this article, was called forth by the introduction among them of a revived Judaism,[1] which resulted in a perverted gospel.[2] We do not use the term Judaism in an offensive, but in its expressive sense. Says Paul, "I profited [in time past] in the *Jews' religion*." That is, he was governed in his religious views by the principles, customs, and traditions of the Jewish church.[3] The gospel which he had now espoused was a different religion, with different objects, and inspiring new hopes and aims. And any attempt to mingle the obsolete principles or customs of "the Jews' religion"[4] with the faith of the gospel was Judaizing. We use the term Judaism, then, as expressive of the principles held by the Jews in their religion; and not as a term of reproach; except in so far as any term which describes error must necessarily be a reproach, be it never so highly esteemed; even as any name indicative of truth and right principles is in reality honorable, be it never so much despised by the masses.

The fundamental error of all Judaism is that it confounds type with antitype; the carnal with the spiritual; the law with

[1] 2: 11–21. [2] 1: 7. [3] vv. 13, 14.
[4] Evidently, by the expression "the Jews' religion" Paul refers not to the *true* religion of the Old Testament Scriptures, but to his experience, as he says, while "after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." (Acts 26: 5.) Pharisaic doctrine was frequently condemned by Christ as corrupting leaven.

UMI

the gospel; the corruptible with the incorruptible; the things which pertain to flesh and blood with those pertaining to the incorruptible state; in short, the temporal with the eternal. This appears in the Galatian heresy. Circumcision was typical; was a sign, or seal, of faith in the seed promised to Abraham.[1] When Christ, the true seed, came, the rite expired by limitation. The promise it looked to was fulfilled; and from thenceforth, in the economy of salvation, "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." All the rites and ceremonies of the Jews' religion were made useless by the death and resurrection of Christ; because they had no merit, except as symbols of faith that God would verify his promises concerning a Redeemer and redemption for the world. Therefore it was foolishness to sacrifice sheep and bullocks for sin in symbol of an expected divine offering for sins, after Jesus had "offered one sacrifice for sins forever, and sat down at the right hand of God" as kingly mediator for all who would come to the Father through him.[2] So, too, it was folly to practice any other of the Jewish ordinances. They had died a natural death;[3] and to practice them was to seek righteousness in the deeds of the law rather than from the great fountain of righteousness, Abraham's promised Seed, and thus fall from grace.[4]

The Judaizing teachers at Galatia sought to impose circumcision upon the church as a means of justification and righteousness. Paul does not direct any special argument against this rite, but lays the ax at the root of the tree, and shows that the whole Mosaic system, with its rites, ceremonies, and temporal promises, was a thing of the past. We, Jews and Gentiles, are no longer under it, or bound by it. We are not under law, but under grace. The reign of the schoolmaster is ended. So he sweeps the Galatian heresy away by showing that not circumcision only, but *all* the typical promises, rites, and ceremonies of the law had ceased to have any obligation; for now "neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision; *but a new creature.*"

And the language the apostle employs in overthrowing this

[1] Gen. 15: 4-6; Rom. 4: 9-11. [2] Heb. 10: 12. [3] Rom. 5: 6; 6: 15; Gal. 2: 25. [4] Gal. 5: 1-6; 2: 15, 16.

exhibition of Judaism is the fervid utterance of one who realizes that he is opposing a fatal error. What must have been the intensity of that conviction which could call from Paul's pen the repeated anathema—"If any preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed!"[1] or the declaration—"I would they were even cut off, which trouble you."[2] Well may every professed teacher of the gospel carefully inquire whether they preach or pervert that gospel which Paul ministered.

The word gospel means simply a good or joyful message. It is good news or glad tidings. The gospel of the kingdom,[3] the gospel of Jesus Christ,[4] the gospel of God,[5] my [Paul's] gospel,[6] the everlasting gospel,[7] and the gospel preached to Abraham,[8] are a unit. They are the same good news of salvation from the fall, by pardon of sin and the obtaining of eternal life through Jesus Christ, together with the final restitution of *all things promised* in him. Whatever other appellations it may receive, it is never called *a* gospel, as though it might be one among many; but it is everywhere and always *the* gospel; as if there were no other, as indeed there is not. True, Paul speaks once of "another gospel;"[9] but he immediately explains that it is not really "another," but is only a seeming, a counterfeit, or perverted gospel.

The Gospel includes all that is revealed pertaining to the salvation which is in or through Jesus Christ, whether it relates to this world, or that which is to come. A perfect understanding of all its parts is not necessary to insure the salvation it brings; though we may safely say that willful ignorance of any portion of it will, if persisted in, fatally jeopardize any soul's prospect for eternal life. Though it is not the object of this article to discuss the amount of knowledge necessary in order to salvation, we may remark the words of Jesus, "He that cometh to me will I in no wise cast out." The chief requirements seem to be a sensibility of a lost condition, and faith in Christ as a savior. If we have faith, and believe that God is, and is the rewarder of them that diligently seek unto him, we may come to him, even if we do not understand the nature of the reward promised, or when and where it is to be given. But after we

[1] Gal. 1: 8, 9. [2] Gal. 5: 12. [3] Matt. 24: 14. [4] Mark 1: 1. [5] 1 Tim. 1: 11. [6] 2 Tim. 2: 8. [7] Rev. 14: 6. [8] Gal. 3: 8. [9] Gal. 1: 6.

are received we must grow in both grace and knowledge of the truth.

Leaving, then, the question of the amount of knowledge essential to salvation, let us inquire when and where the gospel was preached to Abraham, and in what it consisted. And that we may be clearly understood, we remark, that Abraham received two great promises, the one relating to temporal, the other to eternal things; the one to be fulfilled in time, the other in eternity; the former the pledge, or the assurance of the latter. These promises stand related to each other as shadow and substance, as type and antitype. The first and lesser promise was given that we who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel might find strong consolation in the record of God's dealings in the past, because of the assurance it gives of the faithfulness of him who has promised. Finding all that relates to the temporal fulfilled not only to the letter, but in jot and tittle, faith has a sure foundation for confidence, and while we hope for the eternal things which as yet we see not, still do we with patience wait for them.

The first mention we find of Abraham, beyond the bare record of his existence and genealogy, is in the following language:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee; and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families [peoples or nations] of the earth be blessed."[1]

In obedience to this divine call, Abram (for his name had not yet received the significant change) went forth, not knowing whither he went, but intent upon obeying the Lord. And truly no higher motive for obedience could have been presented: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." To be chosen as the instrument of a universal blessing was no small favor. It was enough to fill the ambition of the noblest mind. What this blessing consisted in, and how it has been, or will be conferred, will appear in the sequel.

In his journeyings Abram took Lot, his nephew, with him. And while they sojourned as strangers in the land of promise, their possessions multiplied exceedingly, so that strife arose between Abram's herdsmen and those of Lot. This led to a manifestation of the nobility of Abram's character. Well knowing the strife among the servants, if allowed to continue, would culminate in a quarrel between the masters, he proposed a peaceful separation, where conflicting interests forbade the continuance of the union of many years. Nor did he take advantage of the fact that both his divine call, and his age, gave him the undoubted right of choice; but he simply referred Lot to the two natural divisions of the land, and desired him to make a selection. And Lot beheld the valley of the Jordan, like "the garden of the Lord" for beauty and fertility, and, with selfishness which appears the more inexcusable in contrast with Abram's generosity, he chose the best portion of the land, and "pitched his tent toward Sodom." But his selfish choice proved a curse. His family were corrupted by the wickedness of the inhabitants; and he finally lost his all, and with his two daughters, escaped, with life only, to the mountains.

[1] Gen. 12: 1–3.

On the other hand, Abram's sacrifice brought a blessing. The good news was preached to him as follows:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise walk through the land, in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."[1]

"In this promise, as well as in the one previously quoted, the gospel was obscurely, but none the less truly, preached to Abram: for we understand its fulfillment to involve the three following things: (1) *The resurrection of the dead*, (2) *The gift of immortality to Abraham and his seed*, (3) *An eternal inheritance by them of this earth.* Whether or not these deductions are legitimate, will be seen in the progress of the argument.

We now call the reader's attention to a remarkable covenant, given as a pledge of the promise just quoted, and recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, as follows:

[1] Gen. 13: 14–17.

are received we must grow in both grace and knowledge of the truth.

Leaving, then, the question of the amount of knowledge essential to salvation, let us inquire when and where the gospel was preached to Abraham, and in what it consisted. And that we may be clearly understood, we remark, that Abraham received two great promises, the one relating to temporal, the other to eternal things; the one to be fulfilled in time, the other in eternity; the former the pledge, or the assurance of the latter. These promises stand related to each other as shadow and substance, as type and antitype. The first and lesser promise was given that we who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us in the gospel might find strong consolation in the record of God's dealings in the past, because of the assurance it gives of the faithfulness of him who has promised. Finding all that relates to the temporal fulfilled not only to the letter, but in jot and tittle, faith has a sure foundation for confidence, and while we hope for the eternal things which as yet we see not, still do we with patience wait for them.

The first mention we find of Abraham, beyond the bare record of his existence and genealogy, is in the following language:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee; and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families [peoples or nations] of the earth be blessed."[1]

In obedience to this divine call, Abram (for his name had not yet received the significant change) went forth, not knowing whither he went, but intent upon obeying the Lord. And truly no higher motive for obedience could have been presented: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." To be chosen as the instrument of a universal blessing was no small favor. It was enough to fill the ambition of the noblest mind. What this blessing consisted in, and how it has been, or will be conferred, will appear in the sequel.

In his journeyings Abram took Lot, his nephew, with him. And while they sojourned as strangers in the land of promise, their possessions multiplied exceedingly, so that strife arose between Abram's herdsmen and those of Lot. This led to a manifestation of the nobility of Abram's character. Well knowing the strife among the servants, if allowed to continue, would culminate in a quarrel between the masters, he proposed a peaceful separation, where conflicting interests forbade the continuance of the union of many years. Nor did he take advantage of the fact that both his divine call, and his age, gave him the undoubted right of choice; but he simply referred Lot to the two natural divisions of the land, and desired him to make a selection. And Lot beheld the valley of the Jordan, like "the garden of the Lord" for beauty and fertility, and, with selfishness which appears the more inexcusable in contrast with Abram's generosity, he chose the best portion of the land, and "pitched his tent toward Sodom." But his selfish choice proved a curse. His family were corrupted by the wickedness of the inhabitants; and he finally lost his all, and with his two daughters, escaped, with life only, to the mountains.

[1] Gen. 12: 1-3.

On the other hand, Abram's sacrifice brought a blessing. The good news was preached to him as follows:

"And the Lord said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. Arise walk through the land, in the length of it, and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee."[1]

"In this promise, as well as in the one previously quoted, the gospel was obscurely, but none the less truly, preached to Abram: for we understand its fulfillment to involve the three following things: (1) *The resurrection of the dead*, (2) *The gift of immortality to Abraham and his seed*, (3) *An eternal inheritance by them of this earth.* Whether or not these deductions are legitimate, will be seen in the progress of the argument.

We now call the reader's attention to a remarkable covenant, given as a pledge of the promise just quoted, and recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, as follows:

[1] Gen. 13: 14-17.

ABRAM'S 'WHEREBY.'

"After these things, the word of Jehovah came to Abram, in vision, saying: Fear not, Abram. I am a shield to thee; thy reward is exceeding great. And Abram said: Lord Jehovah, what wilt thou give me? For I go childless; and the heir of my house, he is Eliezer of Damascus. And Abram said: Behold, to me thou hast not given seed; and behold, one of my household will be my heir. And behold, the word of Jehovah came to him, saying: This shall not be thy heir; but one that shall come forth from thine own bowels, he shall be thy heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said: Look now toward heaven, and number the stars, if thou shalt be able to number them. And he said: So shall be thy seed. And he believed in Jehovah; and he reckoned it to him for righteousness.

"And he said to him: I am Jehovah, who brought thee out from Ur of the Chaldæans, to give thee this land to possess it.

"And he said: Lord Jehovah, whereby shall I know that I shall possess it?

"And he said to him: Take for me a heifer three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon. And he took to him all these; and he divided them in the midst, and laid each one's part over against its fellow; but the birds he did not divide.

"And birds of prey came down upon the carcasses; and Abram drove them away. And the sun was about going down, and a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and behold, a horror of great darkness falling upon him. And he said to Abram: Know surely, that thy seed shall be a sojourner in a land that is not theirs, and will serve them; and they will afflict them four hundred years. And the nation which they will serve I judge; and afterward they shall come out with great substance. And as for thee, thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. And in the fourth generation they shall return hither. For the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full. And the sun was gone down, and darkness came on. And behold, a furnace of smoke and fiery flame, that passed between those pieces.

"On that day did Jehovah make a covenant with Abram, saying: To thy seed I give this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates; the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Rephaites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." [1]

In this chapter Abram asks and receives a pledge, which we may call *Abram's "whereby:"* for after God had renewed the promise concerning his seed and his inheritance of the land, he

[1] Bible Union Trans.

said, "Lord God, WHEREBY shall I know that I shall inherit it?" In answer to this question, the Lord commands Abram to prepare the slaughtered animals, as he would for a covenant with another man. He then makes a covenant with Abram concerning his seed only—Abram himself not being included in it—as a surety of the greater promise, relating to Abraham *and* his seed.

One of the items of this "whereby" declares that Abram is to "go to his fathers in peace, and be buried in a good old age." We conclude, therefore, that the promises to him were not to be fulfilled in this state of mortality. This inference is confirmed by the apostle Paul, who says,[1] that when Abram was called to go out into a place he should after receive for an inheritance, he obeyed; and by faith sojourned in the land of promise *as in a strange country*, as did also Isaac and Jacob, heirs with him to the same promise. For he looked for a city built and made by God. These, with countless others, died in faith, *not having received the promises;* but confessed themselves strangers and pilgrims upon the earth. Yet they declared plainly they *sought a country*, and desired a better country, *even a heavenly:* "Wherefore," says the record, "God is not ashamed to be called their God [because they had faith in his promise, through Abram, of a country]: for he hath prepared for them a city," as Abraham expected. And Paul continues the long list of worthies, including those who "were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection," and concludes by saying that these all, from Abel down, having obtained a good report through faith, *received not* the fulfillment of the promise, "God having provided some better thing for us, "that they *without us should not be made perfect.*"

Our conclusion from the record that the promise to Abram *and* his seed related to the immortal and not to the mortal state, thus confirmed, is still further strengthened, or we may say is established as truth by the testimony of Stephen,[2] who declares explicitly that Abraham received no inheritance whatever in this earth. "For he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on. Yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him." So it appears that all the estate Abraham ever held in this world was the common inheritance of Adam's children—a burial place.

[1] Heb. 11: 8, 16. [2] Acts 7: 1-5.

UMI

Now as God has promised an inheritance here on earth to Abraham, he must receive it, or the promise of God will fail. As God's promise cannot fail, and as Abraham is dead, it follows that he must have a resurrection in order to receive the promise. And as the inheritance is promised to him "forever,"[1] it must be a resurrection to immortality.

It is not claimed that this reasoning is either original or new. It originated in the Scriptures, and was well known to the fathers, albeit it has fallen into disuse in this spiritualizing age. Says Henry Dana Ward:

"I confirm this view of the promise made unto the fathers by certain opinions of learned Rabbis, going to show that they also received the promise in the sense it is expounded here. The promise is of the inheritance of the land *forever*. Rabbi Eleazar, who lived just after the second temple was built, writes thus: 'As I live, saith the Lord, I will awake you hereafter in the resurrection of the dead, and will gather you with all Israel into the land of Israel.'

"Jonathan the Paraphrast, who lived before the Christian Era, says on Hos. 14: 8, 'They shall be gathered from their captivity; they shall live under the shadow of Messiah; the dead shall rise, and good shall increase in the earth,' &c.

"'Where does the [Mosaic] law teach the resurrection of the dead? Truly, where it says (Ex. 6: 4), "And I have also established my covenant with them, *that I will give to them* the land of Canaan:" for it is said not to *you* but to *them*. Again, the Sadducees asked Rabbi Gamaliel [Paul's teacher] whence he could prove that God would raise the dead. Nor would they rest, until he had brought them this verse (Deut. 11: 21), "*Which land the Lord swear to your fathers that he would give* THEM."' God covenanted with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to give *them* the land in which they were strangers, for an inheritance; and not having received the inheritance, *they* must needs live again, or in respect to *them* the promise has failed, which is impossible.

"'Rabbi Kimchi, on Obadiah, says, When Rome shall be laid waste, there shall be redemption for Israel. And on Is. 26: 19, The holy blessed God will raise the dead at the time of deliverance. And on Jer. 23: 20, In that he saith *ye* shall consider it, and not *they* shall consider it, he intimateth the resurrection.'

"Dr. Gill furnishes the following (1 Cor. 15: 54): 'When the King Messiah comes, the holy blessed God will raise up those that sleep, as it is written, He shall swallow up death in victory.'

"On Matt. 22: 31, 'The holy blessed God promised to our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that he would give *them* the land of Israel. We learn from hence that they shall be raised, and that God will hereafter give them the land of Israel.'

"It will greatly increase our interest in the prophets, if we observe, from Moses to Malachi, that the promises and threatenings are directly to you and to us, who read and hear, and not to *them* who may come after us. In all the glorious prophecies of Israel's restoration, scattered up and down the sacred page, the word is to *you*, and is not to *them*; the word is spoken to *you* in the second, and not to *them* in the third person: and in order to be fulfilled to the persons to whom it has in past ages been spoken, they must revive, and come out of the grave, and live again; which assuredly they will at the coming and kingdom of Christ in the resurrection of the dead."[1]

But the pledge, or "whereby," of Gen. 15 demands a more extended consideration than we have given it; for it was not intended for Abram alone, but is one of the things which were written aforetime for our learning; that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope;[2] for it will be observed that the items of this pledge only began to be fulfilled in Abraham's day; and his death in a good old age was even one of them. And if, as we have remarked, the covenant of this chapter is given as a pledge, to be fulfilled in a state of mortality, of the greater and better covenant, which can only be realized in the immortal state, when all God's people shall be made perfect,[3] if we can find that it has been fulfilled item by item to the letter, it will be the strongest possible assurance that the exceeding great and precious promises partially shadowed in it, will be also duly received.

In answer to Abram's question, "Whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?" as we have observed, God commands Abram to prepare a sacrifice, according to a long prevalent custom. The animals were divided, the parts laid the one over against the other, and the party or parties making the covenant passed between the pieces, thus invoking upon themselves in case of failure the fate of the sacrificial victims.[4] In this case it should be observed that this is not a covenant between God and Abram, but is *God's covenant with* Abram.[5]

As the sun went down, a deep sleep, and horror of great darkness, fell upon Abram, signifying that he must pass through the

[1] Gen. 13: 15.

[1] *Hope of the Church*, note, pp. 8, 10. [2] Rom. 15: 4. [3] Heb. 11: 40. [4] See Jer. 34: 18-20. [5] See Gal. 3: 20.

state of death to the realization of his inheritance. Then God said:

"Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them: and they shall afflict them four hundred years."

There has been some dispute concerning the fulfillment of this passage. That his seed continued pilgrims and strangers till the time of Moses none dispute; but some have applied the period of four hundred years to the Egyptian bondage alone, while others have regarded it as a "round number," covering all the time of the sojourn from the call of Abram to the exodus. The true application is to *the seed* of Abraham; and the date of its commencement is the mocking of Ishmael at the weaning of Isaac, ending with the four hundred and thirty years of Gal. 3: 17, at the exodus.[1]

"And that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge."

The fulfillment of this prediction in the Egyptian plagues has passed into a proverb. The water turned to blood, the frogs, the lice, the flies, the slaughter of the cattle, the blains and boils, the hail, the locusts, the darkness to be felt, the death of the first born, and finally the destruction of Pharaoh and his hosts, form a chapter of judgments without parallel.

"They shall come out with great substance."

The record tersely says, "They spoiled the Egyptians."

[1] The *Samaritan* Pentateuch, in all its manuscripts and printed copies, reads the place thus: *U moshab beney Yishrael veabotam asher yashebu baarets Cenaan ubaarets mitzraim sheloshim shanah vearba meoth shanah.*

"*Now the sojourning of the children of Israel*, and of their fathers, *which they sojourned* in the land of Canaan, and *in the land of Egypt*, *was* 430."

The same sum is given by St. Paul (Gal. 3: 17), who reckons from the promise made to Abraham, when God commanded him to go to Canaan, to the giving of the law, which soon followed the departure from Egypt; and this chronology of the apostle is concordant with the Samaritan Pentateuch, which, by preserving the two passages, *they and their fathers*, and *in the land of Canaan*, which are lost out of the present copies of the Hebrew text, has rescued this passage from all obscurity and contradiction. It may be necessary to observe, that the Alexandrian copy of the Septuagint has the same reading as that in the Samaritan. The Samaritan Pentateuch is allowed by many learned men to exhibit the most correct copy of the five books of Moses; and the Alexandrian copy of the Septuagint must also be allowed to be one of the most authentic, as well as most ancient copies of this *version* which we possess. As to St. Paul, no man will dispute the authenticity of his statement; and thus in the mouth of these three most respectable witnesses, the whole account is indubitably established. That these three witnesses have the truth, the chronology itself proves; for, from Abraham's entry into Canaan to the birth of Isaac was 25 years. (Gen. 12: 4; 17: 1-21.) Isaac was 60 years old at the birth of Jacob. (Gen. 25: 26.) And Jacob was 130 at his going down into Egypt (Gen. 47: 9), which three sums make 215 years. And then Jacob and his children having continued in Egypt 215 years more, the whole sum of 430 years is regularly completed.—Dr. Clarke on Ex. 12: 40, 41.

"Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

We are told: "And these are the days of the years of Abraham's life which he lived: a hundred and threescore and fifteen years. Then Abraham gave up the ghost,[1] and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years; and was gathered to his people.[2] Though not an aged man as compared with his fathers, he was an old man in his own generation. The words "of years" do not occur in the original. The sense is rather, old, and *satisfied* with life.

"In the fourth generation they shall come hither again."

This passage is explained by the previous term given to the wanderings of Abram's seed—four hundred years. This time expired, they were to return.

At this point in the record, it is stated that "a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between the pieces," as the visible token of "the invisible God," and by this act "in the same day God made a covenant with Abram saying: UNTO THY SEED have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates: the Kenites, the Kennizzites, the Kadmonites, the Hittites, the Perrizzites, the Rephaims, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Girgashites, and the Jebusites."

That this is a distinct promise from that recorded in ch. 13, and referred to in the first verses of ch. 15, must be apparent to even a casual reader. In the one case the parties receiving the prom-

[1] By "giving up the ghost" we now understand giving up his spirit, as by "ghost" we usually suppose "spirit" to be meant. We doubt if the translators intended it to bear this sense; but apprehend that they rather meant it to express the giving up the breath of life, or *breathing out* one's life, which is the true meaning. It is there simply equivalent to the modern and usual phrase, "he expired." The term is thought by Jewish writers to express death by old age only, without previous sickness or pain. This is the kind of death which results from the natural dissolution of the body, when the radical heat and moisture by degrees dry up and wear away. Such a kind of death was that *euthanasia*, that good and easy departure, which was greatly desired by the ancients, and which was indeed desirable, when old age was really venerated, and treated with solicitude and respect—with far more of both than, we fear, it finds under the influences and activities of modern civilization. This kind of death, this gentle sliding out of life, had been promised to Abraham as a blessing. "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace. Thou shalt be buried in a good old age." (Gen. 15: 15.) And we are now informed that this took place, to show that there was no point, however comparatively inconsiderable, in which the promises of God were left unfulfilled.—Kitto. *Bible Illustrations*, pp. 274-5. These remarks are confirmed by Dr. Adam Clarke's able note on this passage, and by the Bible Union and other translations. Lange, Am. Ed., gives "*breathed out*" as the literal rendering of the Hebrew word *gwwa*.

[2] As the writer proposes an article for THE QUARTERLY upon this point, he will here only refer the reader to Josh. 24: 2, 14, 15, which passages declare Abraham's fathers to have been idolaters, and give us the key to the call of Abram unto a strange land "out from" his kindred. Those who claim that this expression teaches a conscious intermediate state will find an insuperable objection to their theory in these passages. We do not remember to have seen it grappled with by any advocate of the conscious intermediate state. There are yet other difficulties, which destroy the Immateralist's claim to this passage, which will be presented at large hereafter.

ise are *Abram* AND *his seed:* "To thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever." While in the second promise, the pledge and type of the first, Abram is excluded—"*Unto thy seed* have I given this land"—which agrees with Stephen's testimony, already referred to, that Abram received as an inheritance not enough to set his foot upon.

Another point of difference is even more striking. In ch. 13, Abram is told to "look northward, southward, eastward, and westward." Now the idea lying upon the face of this language is *boundlessness.* It will not do to assert that the words, "all the land that *thou seest*," limit the expression, and confine this promise to the land of Canaan; because such a claim proves too much. If the words, "all thou seest," are to be taken strictly literally, they cannot include all the land of Canaan; because he could not literally see it all. They are evidently used to carry out the idea of the preceding language, boundlessness; area in general, with no specified bounds. And that this is the correct understanding of the language will appear hereafter.

On the other hand, in the covenant of ch. 15, the land is carefully bounded, as between two well-known rivers; and that there may be no mistake, the nations then occupying the territory are mentioned by name.

We also remark that the covenant of ch. 15 is proved to be *conditional;* while that of ch. 13 is strictly *unconditional.* A vital difference.

Having seen the accomplishment of all the other items of Abram's "whereby," we now inquire, Has this, the last and most important of all, been duly fulfilled? We hope not to weary our readers by the abundance of testimony on this subject; for we propose to give ample proof that it is fulfilled, fully and forever, though we cannot within the limits of an article like this transcribe all the evidence we have on this point.

It is not contended that the original covenants, or promises, and the first allusions to them, are in themselves perfectly clear. They are often obscure, and, like other prophecies, purposely so. They are sometimes mingled, as the painter mingles the objects of a landscape in his first outlines upon the canvass: but as his subsequent skillful touches bring out the perspective, and assign each object its relative position, so subsequent revelation assigns

type and antitype, shadow and substance, to their respective ages with a precision that need not be mistaken.[1]

When the time drew near for Joseph to die, he called his brethren together and took an oath of them, as Jacob had previously taken of him, that they would carry up his bones into Canaan, when God should bring them out of Egypt into the land he swear to give to their fathers. After his decease the troubles of the Israelites began to increase; and while their afflictions were multiplying, the iniquity of the Amorites was filling up.[2] At last the time drew nigh for God to fulfill the covenant he had made with their fathers concerning them—the prophetic period of four hundred years was about run out, and the thrilling narrative of the Exodus begins. At the burning bush God reveals to Moses his purpose concerning Israel, thus:

"I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey: unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites."

The allusion to Gen. 15 in this language is too plain to be misunderstood; as it is, also, in the succeeding verses:

"Go, and gather the elders of Israel together, and say unto them, The Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, appeared unto me saying, I have surely visited you, and seen that which is done to you in Egypt: and I have said, I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt unto the land of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, unto a land flowing with milk and honey."[3]

After the Exodus, there are continued allusions to its object as being that they might go up to possess the land of Canaan in accordance with the promise or covenant made with Abraham. We quote some passages as samples:

"And it shall be when the Lord shall bring thee into the land

[1] Thus we find the land of Canaan sometimes spoken of in the Old Testament as the heritage of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But when the clear light of the Gospel shines, we have no more such allusions, but are told in plain words that the promise to Abraham was that "he should be heir of *the world*;" "the field is *the world*;" "the meek shall inherit *the earth*;" and the promised restitution of "all things" is found to be in the new, or renewed earth. (2 Pet. 3; Rev. 21.) Canaan being the type of the full inheritance, and included in it, could in the time of types and shadows, while the promises were still involved in some obscurity, be most properly spoken of as the inheritance of the fathers.

[2] Gen. 15: 16. [3] Ex. 3: 8, 16, 17.

of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, which he swear unto thy fathers to give thee, a land flowing with milk and honey, that thou shalt keep this service in this month."[1]

"For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and I will cut them off. Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor serve them, nor do after their works: but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images. And ye shall serve the Lord your God, and he shall bless thy bread, and thy water; and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee....And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before thee....I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased, and inherit the land. And I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river: for I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand; and thou shalt drive them out before thee. Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their gods. They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me: for if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee."[2]

This latter quotation is more than an intimation of the conditional nature of the covenant under which they were going up to possess Canaan; and in Lev. 26 it is plainly declared, at length, that a course of sin and iniquity would result in scattering them from the land promised for a possession. But we have proof of the conditional nature of this promise in the history of the events following the mission and report of the spies. These returned, all agreed that the land was truly described as full of fatness, and "flowing with milk and honey." But ten out of the twelve were appalled at the power and presence of the Canaanite nations. Their cities were walled up to heaven, and the inhabitants were giants in comparison with whom to the fearful hearts of the spies themselves were but as grasshoppers.[3]

The contagion of fear spread. Except a few, the people forgot that God was able to fulfill that he had promised. All his mighty works in their behalf seemed to have fled from their memory, and in high walls and men of mighty stature they saw insuperable difficulties to him whose tread had made the very mountains tremble and smoke as a furnace in their presence. Faith gone, their hearts melted, and the fiat went forth, that *because of unbelief they should not enter in.*[4]

[1] Ex. 13: 5. [2] Ex. 23: 23–33. [3] Num. 13: 27–33. [4] Heb. 3: 19.

"Surely they shall not see the land which I swear unto their fathers....As truly as I live, saith the Lord, as ye have spoken in my ears, so will I do to you: your carcasses shall fall in this wilderness, and all that were numbered of you, according to your whole number, from twenty years old and upward, which have murmured against me, doubtless ye shall not come into the land, concerning which *I swear to make you dwell therein*, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun. But your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, *them will I bring in*, and they shall know the land which ye have despised."[1]

Conclusively the fulfillment of the promise concerning them depended upon the exhibition of the required character on their part. Only two of them lived to "possess the land."

As the forty years of wanderings drew to a close, Moses reminds the people of their record:

"Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thine heart, dost thou go to possess their land: but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee, and that he may perform the word which the Lord swear unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Understand therefore, that the Lord thy God giveth thee not this good land to possess it for thy righteousness; for thou art a stiff-necked people."[2]

"For ye shall pass over Jordan to go in to possess the land which the Lord your God giveth you, and *ye shall possess it*, and dwell therein."[3]

"And Moses called unto Joshua, and said unto him in the sight of all Israel, Be strong and of a good courage; for thou must go with this people unto the land which the Lord hath sworn unto their fathers to give them; and thou shalt *cause them to inherit it.*"[4] [And to the people he said], "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply: and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it."[5]

Moses foretold that Joshua should divide the land for an inheritance to Israel, and even "so Joshua took *the whole land*.... and gave it for an inheritance unto Israel according to their di-

[1] Num. 14: 27–31. [2] Deut. 9: 5, 6. [3] Deut. 11: 31. [4] Deut. 31: 6. [5] Deut. 30: 15.

visions by their tribes."[1] And in the conclusion of Joshua's ministry God says through him to Israel: "And I brought you into the land of the Amorites, which dwelt on the other side Jordan; and they fought with you: and I gave them into your hand, that ye might possess their land; and I destroyed them from before you....And ye went over Jordan, and came unto Jericho: and the men of Jericho fought against you, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Girgashites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites: AND I DELIVERED THEM INTO YOUR HAND....*And I* HAVE GIVEN YOU *a land for which ye did not labor.*"[2]

Nor did their great leader fail in his last counsel to remind them of the fulfillment of *all* God had promised them, and the tenure by which they could continue in possession of all:

"And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that *not one thing hath failed of all the good things* which the Lord your God spake concerning you; *all are come to pass unto you*, and not one thing hath failed thereof. Therefore it shall come to pass, that as all good things are come upon you, which the Lord your God promised you; so shall the Lord bring upon you all evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which the Lord your God hath given you. When ye have transgressed the covenant of the Lord your God, which he commanded you, and have gone and served other gods, and bowed yourselves to them; then shall the anger of the Lord be kindled against you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which he hath given unto you."[3]

The Psalmist several times alludes to the fulfillment of this covenant.[4] And in the prophets as well as in the historical records we find frequent allusions to the fact that they held their inheritance by promise, and upon conditions. Jeremiah is very plain. In his eleventh chapter God calls upon Israel to remember his covenant and obey him in order that he may be able to perform the oath he swear unto their fathers concerning their land. He then denounces the *curses* of the covenant. And in ch. 32 the prophet says:

"And HAST GIVEN THEM THIS LAND, which thou didst swear to their fathers to give them, a land flowing with milk and honey;

[1] Josh. 11: 23. [2] Josh. 24: 8, 11, 13. [3] Josh. 23: 14-16. [4] 1 Chron. 16: 15-22; Ps. 105: 42-45; 44: 3; 67: 55.

and they came in, AND POSSESSED IT; but they obeyed not thy voice, neither walked in thy law; they have done nothing of all that thou commandedst them to do: therefore thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them."

Daniel, in his memorable prayer just before the close of the captivity, alludes to the same promise, its fulfillment, and its conditions.[1]

But the most direct testimony, and which settles the matter beyond controversy, is that of Nehemiah. He declares "the children went in, and POSSESSED THE LAND, and thou subduedst before them the inhabitants of the land,....and they took strong cities and a fat land,....and were filled....and delighted themselves in thy great goodness." And this in the following language he declares was the fulfillment of the covenant of Gen. 15:

"Thou art the Lord the God, who didst choose Abram, and broughtest him forth out of Ur of the Chaldees, and gavest him the name of Abraham; and foundest his heart faithful before thee, and madest a covenant with him to give the land of the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Jebusites, and the Girgashites, *to give it I say* TO HIS SEED, and *hast* PERFORMED THY WORDS; for thou art righteous."[2]

Having traced the fulfillment of the minor promise to its completion, and ascertained that the natural seed of Abraham, as such, have received all their portion under the Abrahamic covenant, we turn our attention to the greater promise. And while we do this, let us bear in mind as we turn from the Jews' sad story, that as the generation that came out of Egypt "could not enter in because of unbelief;"[3] and as their children failed to retain their inheritance when once gained for the same reason;[4] so we stand by faith,[5] and may fear lest a promise being left us of entering the pre-figured rest, any of us should come short of it. For the word preached is not profitable except it be mixed with faith in us that hear,[6] and the beginning of our confidence be held stedfast unto the end.

We return now to

THE PROMISES OF ETERNAL THINGS.

We inquire first, Who are included by the language addressed to Abraham—"To thee and to thy seed?" Can this "seed" be

[1] ch. 9. [2] ch. 9: 7, 8. [3] Heb. 3: 19. [4] Rom. 11: 20. [5] Heb. 4: 1, 2; 3: 14.

he same spoken of as destined to crush the head of our arch-foe?[1] Can it be the great "seed" of David, destined to a reign *without end* on the throne of Israel?[2] Let us hear Paul: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made [the promises involving *eternal redemption*]. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, *And to thy seed*, WHICH IS CHRIST."[3] This is the key to open the Abrahamic gospel. The bars of obscurity in prediction are turned aside by the key of inspired interpretation. Let us not interpret interpretations, but receive them.

We find, then, that the parties to this covenant are Abraham and Christ. Abraham is included as the chosen progenitor of the typical people, of whom is salvation: for from them sprung the Messiah, and of whom we read:

"I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."[4]

If this were all in this connection, it might be urged that the Jews had broken the covenant, and brought the whole scheme to naught. But Paul only introduces this language in order to meet this very objection. He wishes to show that however their backsliding might affect them and their relations to the promises, it could by no means destroy the promises of God in Christ. And why? Because it is "not as though the word of God had taken none effect. *For they are not all Israel which are of Israel:* neither because they are *the seed of Abraham* are they *all children:* but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are *the children of the flesh* THESE ARE NOT THE CHILDREN OF GOD: but the CHILDREN OF THE PROMISE are counted for the seed."[5]

Can any explanation make these words clearer? Paul has been talking of the promised resurrection, restitution, and glorification. The natural seed, or children of the flesh, are *not all* children, or heirs of God, joint-heirs with Christ, to the promises,

[1] Gen. 3: 15. [2] Luke 1: 33. [3] Gal. 3: 16. [4] Rom. 9: 1-5. [5] Rom. 9: 6-8.

but they belong to a class called "the children of the promise." Who are they? Let Paul answer: "Now we, BRETHREN, as Isaac was, are the children of promise."[1] Not "born after the flesh," but children by faith.

"But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.[2] . . . There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."[3]

Let the Abrahamic promise include what it may, the foregoing language shuts us up to the faith that sex, condition, or nationality have no weight whatever in determining who shall be partakers in it: character is the sole test of participation. And thus Paul silences and puts to shame those who had distracted the church with claims of Jewish superiority.

"Heirs according to the promise." Turning to the record of the promise, we find among the chiefest of its provisions these words: "In thee shall all nations be blessed." Does scripture interpret this language also, so as to leave us in no doubt of its meaning? It does. In the third chapter of Acts we read:

"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days.

"Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

In the gift of gifts, the blessing of blessings, God's own Son with power on earth to forgive sins, we find the peculiar blessing of the Abrahamic covenant: for whatever is included in the promise of eternal redemption, all is obtained through him, by the forgiveness of our sins and in turning away from our iniquities. Let none take from Christ this glory, and give it, as some unfortunately have done, to one or more of the items of our in-

[1] Gal. 4: 28. [2] Comp. Rom. 11: 32. [3] Gal. 3: 22, 26, 29.

UMI

heritance; for we have Peter's word for it, that the promise to make Abraham a blessing to all families of earth was fulfilled in sending Jesus with full power to turn all who would be turned from their iniquities.

It is a popular theory that the promise of blessing to all nations means their conversion, *en masse*, some placing the event before, and some after the Second Advent. The advocates of both these theories rely upon much the same passages to sustain their view. On examination it will be found that in most cases the context of these very passages overthrows the theory they are pressed to sustain. For instance: Ps. 2: 8 is most popular at missionary meetings. The next verse however is omitted. Let us put them together:

THE VERSE QUOTED.	THE VERSE OMITTED.
"Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."	"Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."

The reason for the omission is too apparent to call for italics even. The neglected passage suggests the dread symbolism of the last verses of the nineteenth of Revelation, rather than the scenes of the fabled Millennium.

Paul makes a definite application of this promise. He says "it is of faith, that it might be of grace; to the end that it might be sure to ALL the seed: not to that only which is of the law [God's saints under that dispensation]; but to that also which is *of the faith* of Abraham, who is *the father of us all*, as it is written: I have made thee a father of many nations." And that there may be no mistake, he also declares: "When ye read ye may understand my knowledge of the mystery of Christ[1] .... now revealed, ... that the Gentiles should be FELLOW-HEIRS, AND OF THE SAME BODY, AND PARTAKERS of his promise in Christ by the gospel." And another apostle asserts that this visitation of the Gentiles is "to TAKE OUT OF THEM a people for his name."[2]

Having found the Redeemer and the redeemed, let us now look for "the land" of this Abrahamic gospel. Once more we turn to Paul. He says that "the promise that he should be heir

[1] *Mystery* here means a truth which had previously been hidden, or purposely kept in obscurity: not something difficult of comprehension—though indeed many seem to find it so.
[2] Acts 15: 14.

of the world [the *kosmos*, or physical globe] was not to Abraham or his seed through the law; but through the righteousness of faith." In Ephesians he presents the Spirit as the earnest of our inheritance until *the redemption* of the *purchased* possession." In the thirteenth of Matthew we have the purchase recorded. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hid in a field; the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and *buyeth that field*."[1] "The field is the world," said Jesus;[2] the same Jesus who, although he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor; and for us left the glory he had with the Father before the world was, that out of the world he might redeem his Bride. Most of her members are now hidden in the field; but it is a *purchased* field; and ere long will be redeemed, and then "the hidden treasure" will be manifested.

The Psalmist foresaw the extent of the inheritance. Seven times in one Psalm[3] he reiterates that the earth shall be the abode of the saints. "Such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be cut off." And the epoch of their entrance into their possession is also clearly fixed by him: "Wait on the Lord and keep his way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land [earth]: *when the wicked are cut off* [their punishment, indicated in the preceding verse; not their *conversion*], thou shalt see it"—the promised land. This is all plainly literal language, easily understood. Need we quote Isaiah's testimony concerning the new earth, or Daniel's prediction of a kingdom under the whole heavens, or Christ's renewal of the promise to the meek, or Paul's heavenly country with its capital built by God, or Peter's expression of the Church's hope of a new heaven and earth, or the Revelator's ecstatic vision of the same? Our hearts glow with even this reference to the views they give of our eternal home; but our allotted space is already full; and a few words concerning

THE CONSUMMATION

of the gospel preached to Abraham must suffice. The Revelator in his fifth chapter relates a vision which brings to our view the innumerable company, like the sand by the sea-shore, gathered *out of* all nations. Of them it is said:

[1] The absurdity of the too common application of this parable is apparent on a little thought. Do men *purchase* salvation? or is it a free gift, bought without money or price? In the parable is a *bona fide* purchase.
[2] V. 38. [3] The 37th.

"And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and WE SHALL REIGN ON THE EARTH."[1]

With such positive testimony as this before them, how did the Church ever learn to sing that absurdity—

"Beyond the bounds of time and space [!]
Look forward to a heavenly place,
The saints' secure abode."

The refrain of the saints answers back, No: "*we* shall live and reign *on the earth*."

Again, John carried away in vision beheld the redeemed in the enjoyment of the fruition of the promises, made unto the fathers. The adversary's head is crushed; his works destroyed; the last traces of sin swept from the universe; the hopes of bereaved ones justified in reunion with their loved and lost ones; tears dried; faith lost in sight; hope fully realized; the last enemy destroyed.

"After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.

"And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshiped God, saying, Amen: blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God forever and ever. Amen.

"And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?

"And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest.

"And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes."

[1] Rev. 5: 9, 10.

THE BLISSFUL VISION.

I sat me down to muse one weary day,
And soon in thought was wandering far away.
Before me rose a shining, narrow gate;
It swung, and lo! a saintly form did wait
Within for me. Amazed I saw him stand
And stretch his own to grasp my mortal hand.
"Come unto me," he said, "earth-weary child,
And I will teach thee;" and so sweetly smiled
That all my fears were fled, and by his side
I held his hand—my more than mortal guide.
And he was speaking as he led me forth:
And first he told me, "This is God's new earth;"
And I had guessed it, though my searching eyes
Had swept but once the landscape and the skies.
For at my feet the soil seemed new and clean,
And all the grass grew thickly fresh and green,
Which all among were flowers of every hue,
And bursting buds just pushing into view.
And trees, and vines, and all I saw below
Seemed beautiful as God could make them grow.
And I was thinking of a sacred verse
When he who led me, spake it; "*No more curse*—"
And I was listening as we passed along
To catch the floating snatches of a song,
Till coming nearer, thus I caught the strain,
"Worthy the Lamb for us that once was slain."
I gazed entranced, for mighty hosts were singing,
And golden harps with richest tones were ringing,
As now the glad refrain came pouring forth:
"*For us*, and we shall reign upon the earth!"
What beams of glory danced on every brow,
And every cheek wore health and beauty now.
"And is disease a stranger here?" I asked, full fain.
My guide responding answered, "*No more pain.*"
He brought me and we wandered long beside
A flowing river, deep, and clear, and wide,
Till high on either bank, a branching wood,
Kissing the sky in awful grandeur, stood
With monthly fruitage full. "Life's trees," he saith,
And then kept on repeating, "*No more death.*"
My eyes were chained intent, till when my guide
Bade me look farther back, on either side,
And lo! a city—but with mortal tongue,
I stop and leave its glories all unsung.
And now such radiant light around was shining
Methought ourselves beyond the day's declining;
For wave on wave the city flashed afar,
Its dazzling splendor like a burning star.
And he who led me, read my thoughts aright,
And spake them shortly, saying, "*No more night.*"
What! "*No more curse, nor pain, nor death, nor night?*"
Bright vision of a world, surpassing bright!
"And can it be that things will always stay,
As beautiful, and glorious, as they seem to-day?"
I said, as coming to the shining gate
My guide still holding me, content to wait;
"Always," he said, "the nature of this clime
Is one bright, balmy, constant summer-time."—*J. Albert Libby.*

THE DURATION AND NATURE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

By the Rev. Henry Constable, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland.

Future punishment for the sins of the present life is universally allowed to be taught in Scripture; but, with respect to its nature and its duration, very opposite opinions have been and are maintained as being each of them the doctrine of God's Word. We speak only of punishment to be inflicted subsequent to the judgment. With the condition of the soul in its separate state in *hades* we have here nothing to do.

There are three main opinions relative to this punishment. One of these makes it to be essentially of a purgative nature, to be temporary in its duration, and to have as its issue the restoration of all to God's favor and eternal happiness. This was the opinion of Origen. The second is that which has heretofore been most commonly received. It makes punishment to be eternal in its duration, and supposes that, throughout this eternity, the damned continue to live in a state of pain. This was the theory of Augustine. According to the third opinion, punishment is eternal; but *death; i. e.*, the cessation of life, is its very essence, attended and preceded by such various degrees of pain as a just and merciful God, for wise reasons, sees fit to inflict. The third of these opinions is the one here maintained. Its establishment will of course set aside the others. Its eternal duration will overthrow that of Origen: its character, involving a state of death, will overthrow both Origen's view and also the theory of everlasting pain. We rest its proof on repeated declarations of Scripture, and on arguments drawn from the character of God.

With respect to the eternity of future punishment, we will be brief. To us it has always appeared that, as clearly as Scripture teaches that there will be punishment, with the same clearness it teaches that it will be eternal—without end. We will give the chief grounds on which we rest our opinion.

In the first place, its duration is described in the very same terms as the happiness of the redeemed: "These," saith Christ, speaking of the reprobate, "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."[1] Here the same Greek word[2] is used for the duration of these opposite states. If, as all allow, it means eternal in the case of the righteous, it surely must mean so in that of the wicked. How absurd would such a translation as this be—"These shall go away into punishment which is not eternal; but the righteous into life which is eternal!"

Again: our Lord has repeatedly declared, that there are persons who, at no time and under no change of dispensation, shall have forgiveness: "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."[3] This appears wholly inconsistent with the idea that such persons should, after a certain amount of punishment, enter into the peace of God.

What Christ has here said of one class of sinners, he has said elsewhere in (if possible) stronger language of all who reject him: "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."[4] If, after a certain purgation, such men passed from a state of punishment into one of happiness, these words of Christ—we say it with all reverence—would not and could not be true; for such men would see life, on such men the wrath of God would not abide.

Again: there are persons of whom our Lord affirms that it would have been better for them if they had not been born.[5] Such an affirmation is incompatible with the idea that they should after a punishment of any conceivable length, enter upon a life of bliss. The first moment of release would make amends for all past suffering; throughout eternity they would praise God that they had been born.

Once more: the following argument, proving a state of death to be the condition to which the reprobate are finally reduced, is fatal to the idea of their restoration to favor. We might fancy a life of misery exchanged for one of peace, but to the dead there could come no change at all. They would first need another recreation, of which certainly no word of Scripture gives us any hint.

For these, and other reasons, we are persuaded that punishment will be of an eternal duration. The judgment once passed, God holds out no hope beyond. Man now makes his choice of

[1] Matt. 25: 46. [2] *Aionios.* [3] Matt. 12: 31; Luke 12: 10. [4] John 3: 36. [5] Matt. 26: 24; Mark 14: 21.

one or other condition hereafter, each of which will be alike eternal.

In what will this eternal state consist? That is now our question. We hold that it does not consist in any eternal life spent in pain of body, or remorse of mind, but that a state of utter death and destruction, is that state which abides forever. The length of time which this process of dissolution takes, and the degrees of bodily or mental pain which precede and accompany it, are questions which we must leave to that providence of God which rules in hell as in heaven. One thing only we can with certainty gather. It is, that the process of dissolution will afford scope for that great variety of punishment, which the reprobate will suffer hereafter, from that which in its justice is terrible to that which, with equal justice, is scarcely felt at all.

We need not stop to argue that, between this view of punishment and that which maintains an eternal existence in pain, there is no comparison. The present life shows us this. When hope has ceased to cheer its future, men willingly lay it aside for death; when pain has made it a weary burden, the friends of the sufferer thank God for its termination. So the close of each agonized life in hell would be longed for there; would send a thrill of relief through the inhabitants of heaven.

It may be well to say a few words on the probable reasons which have from a very ancient period led a majority of Christians to hold the doctrine of an eternal life of pain, as it will be requisite to show that one of these reasons is without foundation before we proceed to the establishment of our own view.

Before the preaching of the Gospel, the highest order of heathen intellect had framed for its satisfaction a theory of the immortality of the soul. While the generality of heathen philosophers taught that death was for all an eternal sleep,[1] there were 'high spirits of old' that strained their eyes to see, beyond the clouds of time, the dawning of immortality. Unable, as we are able, to connect it with God as its source, and with his promise as our assurance, they framed the idea of an immortality, self-existing in the soul itself. Plato, in his *Phædo*, has given us the marvelous reasoning of Socrates, and Cicero has exhibited the argument in his *Tusculan Questions*. According to it, the soul is possessed of an inherent immortality. It is of necessity eter-

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. 2, p. 91. Ed. Paris, 1615.

nal. It could have no end: no death. What was true of one soul, was true of all souls alike, whether good or bad. They must exist somewhere, be it in Tartarus, or Cocytus, in Pyriphlegethon, or the happy abodes of the purified. This sublime philosophical idea passed readily and early into the theology of the Christian Church. We find it running throughout the reasoning of Tertullian and Augustine.[1] Heedless of Paul's warning voice against philosophy, they became the feeble apes of Plato. They applied their theology, as he his philosophy, to all souls alike—to those of the rebrobate as of the redeemed. They taught that the life of the former *must be* as eternal as that of the latter.

To this view the declarations of Scripture relative to future punishment were attached, and by it these declarations were moulded.[2] The eternity of this punishment, and the many passages which speak of life and pain as existing, at least in some classes of the damned, in hell, were joined to the heathen doctrine of the immortality of the soul; and hence was formed the plausible and generally accepted view, that not only was future punishment eternal, but that it also consisted in eternal life spent in eternal pain. The fears of mankind, and the laudable desire, on the part of Christian teachers, to warn by the most terrible of all denunciations, filled in this awful description of the future of the lost. The utter callousness to suffering, produced by the long reign of heathen cruelty, and shared to some extent even by the Christian mind of the period, bore it without a shudder, if not with positive satisfaction.[3]

The foundation of this theory was a mere fancy: that which gave continuity to its parts was but a rope of sand. The essential immortality of the soul was, as Pliny called it, a figment. Its inherent fallacy will be to us apparent from the fact, that it involved of necessity *a past eternity of the soul* as much as a future. Cicero gives it expression where he says of the soul, "it can neither be born nor can it die."[4] Some of the Fathers, shunning the first part of the proposition, eagerly adopted the second. They were just as wrong as, only less consistent than, the heathen thinkers. Others, judging more truly, rejected all idea of any essential immortality of the soul.[5] Scripture denies the entire proposition: its second part as much as its first. . . . To our

[1] Tertullian, *De Anima*, Paris, 1675; Augustine, *Civ. Dei*, 21: 3. Antwerp, 1700.
[2] Tertullian, ap. 22, p. 22.
[3] *Eternity of Future Punishment*. G. Salmon, D. D., 2nd ed., p. 19.
[4] Tusc. Disp. 1: 22.
[5] Justin Martyr, pp. 206-7, 264; Irenæus, *Cont. Hær.* 2, 34, p. 128, ed. Paris, 1675.

UMI

aspirations for eternity it answers by the promise of eternal life through Christ Jesus. But there it stops. An essential immortality of the soul it denies as explicitly as it denies it to the body. To one being only—to God—does it allow to have life in himself: of one being only—God—does it allow immortality; *i.e.*, the absolute incapacity of death[1] to be an attribute.[2] And here, as in everything else, Scripture is the book of the highest reason. That which has had a beginning may have an end. That on which God has bestowed life he may and can inflict death. The highest intelligences as much as the lowest must depend on him for the continuance of their life. Let him withdraw his sustaining power and the mighty Archangel becomes a thing of nought as completely as the insect which dances in the sunbeams for an hour and then passes away forever.

Having removed all obstacles arising from an erroneous notion of the nature of the soul, we proceed to consider the direct proofs of our view. We will first advert to the testimony of the Old Testament. This indeed is by no means so clear, either as to the future of the redeemed or the lost, as the New Testament, but there are undoubtedly many places in it which speak of both.

We will first advert to the original conception of death. It was very early spoken of by God himself. "In the day that thou eatest" of the tree of knowledge, he said to Adam, "thou shalt surely die."[3] God explains his word to man—"dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return."[4] God's definition of the death inflicted for the first transgression is frequently repeated in different words in the later Scriptures. Thus Paul tells us that it is the death which all men undergo, whether they are among the saved or the lost.[5] Such too was that death which Christ endured for human sin—the same death which the thieves beside him suffered, "even the death of the cross."[6] We have thus the original meaning of death clearly and explicitly displayed in Scripture. It did not mean life spent in pain, but the loss of the life which God first gave to man in Eden. Such was man's primitive idea of death. Such was the universal idea formed of it wherever men lived and died. In their own case and in that of the lower creatures, they saw it exemplified every day. The idea first presented by God was perpetuated by universal experience.

Language, we know, assumes a variety of meaning. Words sometimes undergo so many subtle changes of sense, that their latter meaning becomes the direct opposite to their first. The word death has, however, remained true to its original import in its various applications. Thus, we have in Scripture the state of spiritual death, or the being "dead in trespasses and sins:" we have the expressions "dead to sin," "dead to the law:" in our catechism we have the phrase 'a death unto sin:' in ordinary life we speak of persons as being dead to certain passions. All such expressions are derived from material death, and are true to its original sense. They imply the departure of relations and feelings which once were living and strong—*their death*. To the universal sense imposed on death in all times and by all nations, there is but one exception, that given to it in the theology of a porton of Christendom. In that theology, and in that alone, death is made to mean its direct opposite—*life*.

But this late meaning attached by many Christians to the term death in one of its applications, namely: to future punishment, has not the smallest force as regards its use in the Old Testament. There the word must be taken in the sense stamped upon it and unaltered. There it is over and over again described as the end in the future world of obstinate transgressors. For such, God declares he has "provided the *instruments of death*:" of such as hate divine wisdom that Wisdom says "they that hate me *love death*:" to the wicked God saith "thou shalt surely die:" "the soul that sinneth it shall die."[1]

No one, we suppose, will apply such expressions to that death which all alike undergo as the children of Adam. They can only apply to future punishment. Death, then, according to the Old Testament, is to be after judgment the result of sin, as life is the result of righteousness. Can we suppose a God of truth, of justice, and of mercy to mean by this well-understood phrase something unknown to his hearers, of a character the very opposite to what they had from his own teaching conceived, and conveying a doom unutterably greater? The idea is monstrous. God speaks to men only in the language of men. But hence it follows as a matter of course that the loss of life in the future world is the doom pronounced against sinners in the Old Testament.

But it is not only by this phrase "death," that the Old Testament describes the punishment of the ungodly. By every ex-

[1] *Athanasia.* [2] John 5: 26; 1 Tim. 6: 16. [3] Gen. 2: 17. [4] Gen. 3: 19. [5] Rom. 5: 12, 14, 17; 1 Cor. 15: 22. [6] Phil. 2: 8; Acts 2: 24; Rom. 5: 7, 8.

[1] Ps. 7: 13; Prov. 8: 36; 11: 4; Ezek. 3: 18; 18: 4; 33: 8.

UMI

pression in the Hebrew language significant of loss of life, loss of existence, the resolution of organized substance into its original parts, its reduction to that condition in which it is, as though it had never been called into being—by every such expression does the Old Testament describe the end of the ungodly. "The *destruction* of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together:" "prepare them for the *day of slaughter*:" "*the slain* of the Lord shall be many:" "they shall go forth and look upon *the carcasses* of the men that have sinned:" "God shall *destroy* them:" "they shall be *consumed*:" "they shall be *cut off*:" "they shall be *rooted out of the land of the living*:" "*blotted out of the book of life*:" "*they are not.*"[1] The Hebrew scholar will see from the above passages, that there is no phrase of the Hebrew language, significant of all destruction short of absolute annihilation, which is not used to denote the end of the ungodly.

For the benefit of the English reader we will present a few instances of the meaning of some of these phrases in things which relate to this present life. There are several Hebrew words applied to future punishment translated by the word perish. *Ovad* is one of the most common of these. Let us see its use in things of which we are able to judge. When Heshbon was utterly cut off by the sword of Israel: when a prediction of extermination is pronounced against the house of Ahab: when the memory of the wicked has departed from the earth: when Esther apprehends her death at the hands of Ahasuerus; it is this word which is used: they have, or will, or may perish.[2] *Horas* is another term in frequent use for future punishment. What is its meaning in common life? When the altar of Baal was thrown down, stone after stone: when the strongholds of Zion were leveled to the ground: when a wall is broken down so that its foundations are discovered; this is the term used.[3] Again: God will *destroy* the ungodly. One Hebrew word for this is *tsomath.* It is used in the sense of utterly cutting off and destroying from a place.[4] Another Hebrew word is *shomad.* It is significant of utter extinction. When the women of the tribe of Benjamin had been slain: when the nations of Canaan disappeared before the sword of Israel: when Moab ceased to be a nation: this is the word used for their destruction.[5] Again: the wicked will be *cut off.*

[1] Is. 1: 28; 66: 16, 24; Jer. 12: 3; Ps. 28: 5; 37: 20; 73: 27; 37: 38; 52: 5; 69: 28; Job 27: 19. [2] Num. 21: 30; 2 Kings 9: 8; Job 18: 17; Est. 4: 16. [3] Judges 6: 28; Lam. 2: 2; Ezek. 18: 14. [4] *Furst. Gesenius*, Ps. 60: 4; 101: 5-8. [5] Judges 21: 16; Deut. 12: 30; Jer. 48: 42.

The Hebrew is *korath* in Nifal. What is its use in common life? When truth has become extinct from a sin-loving people: when weapons of war are broken in pieces: when life at the period of the flood perished from the earth: when the life of an offender against the law of Moses was taken; this is the word used: *they are cut off.*[1] By another word, *notats*, God threatens future destruction. In matters of this life it indicates destruction of an utter kind. When the infected house of the leper was cast down and dismantled: when the images of Baal were broken in pieces: when the stones of the altar of the sun were ground into powder—this is the word used for the process of destruction.[2]

We need go no further for the testimony of the Old Testament. By every term it has pointed out the punishment of the wicked as consisting, not in life, but in the loss of life; not in their continuance in that organized form which constitutes man, but in its dissolution, its resolution into its original parts, its becoming as though it had never been called into existence. While the redeemed are to rejoice in a life which knows no end, the lost are to be reduced to a death which knows of no awaking forever and ever.

It will be well here to answer an objection which may be made to this view of future punishment, viz: that in taking from it an eternity of consciousness and pain, we are in fact taking from it its character of eternity. It may be said that is not punishment at all which is not felt to be punishment. This is reasoning which will not stand examination. If eternal life be the life restored by Christ, then the loss of this life is a punishment of as enduring a nature as the eternal life itself. And here the first death affords a perfect analogy to the second. From the earliest records of our race, in every land, by men of every creed, by believers in and deniers of a future life, capital punishment has been reckoned as not only the greatest but the most lasting of all punishment. In fact, it is only because it is the most lasting that it is the greatest. The pain incurred in the process lasts but for a few moments. It is yet regarded as the longest punishment, because it has deprived the sufferer of every hour of that life which but for it he would have had. Its duration is supposed to be coextensive with the period of his natural life. "The laws," says Augustine, "do not estimate the punishment of a criminal by the

[1] Jer. 7: 28; Zech. 9: 10; Gen. 9: 11; Ex. 30: 33. [2] Lev. 14: 45; 2 Kings 11: 18; 23: 12.

brief period during which he is being put to death, but by their removing him forever from the company of living men.'"[1] This is readily applied to future punishment. The loss of every year of the life which the sinner might have had but for his sin is a punishment; and because the life is eternal, the punishment is eternal also.[2] There is here no straining of argument to make out a case: the argument is one which man's judgment has in every age approved as true.

A vast amount of misconception, and consequently of needless controversy, has arisen from the mistaken idea that eternal death is not properly eternal punishment. One class of reasoners, holding eternal punishment, think it necessary to argue against eternal death as not being its equivalent: while another class, holding more or less the doctrine of eternal death, feel bound to argue against eternal punishment from not perceiving that the eternal death which they hold is in truth its full equivalent. One class, again, imagine that in proving eternal punishment, they have proved eternal life in torments, and the other, that in overthrowing the notion of the latter, they have overthrown the former also.[3]

We now turn to the New Testament. We shall find it in perfect agreement with the Old. We will consider its testimony in the same order. Before, however, bringing forward its statements, we will make a few observations on a new feature here introduced, viz: the change of language adopted in the publication of the Gospel revelation.

We remark, then, that the writers of the New Testament not only must be supposed to follow the sense already fixed on the terms expressive of future punishment in the Hebrew Scriptures, but that they also give us another guarantee as to their meaning by their usage of the Greek tongue. The Gospel, revealed and recorded chiefly by Jews, is recorded, not in a provincial dialect, but in the language of the Roman world. We have here a guarantee as to their meaning, whose overpowering force on the present question we will show a little farther on. Paul, and Luke, and John, and Peter use a language which they had no hand in forming or moulding, but which was already provided for them to be the vehicle of their thoughts. They made no claim to alter

[1] *De Civ. Dei*, 21: 11.
[2] Irenæus, 5: 27; Witsius. *Economy of the Covenants*, I. 5: 42.
[3] *Eternity of Future Punishment*. G. Salmon, D. D., p. 1, &c.; *Eternal Punishment*. J. W. Barlow, M. A., p. 4, &c.

the world's tongue, but to alter the faith of the world through the medium of that tongue which the world used and understood, when they were children, learning the meaning of its words from their elders. The ordinary Classical Lexicon, not Lexicons of the New Testament, colored and tainted by theological opinion, is the true guide to the Greek of the New Testament. It is only where an idea new to the human mind is brought before it that we have a right to look for a new or a modified phrase whose sense is to be stamped upon it by the teachers of the novel truth.

We will first draw attention to the fact that the punishment of the wicked is just as frequently described *as their death* in the New Testament as in the Old, and this by the terms death or to die,[1] without the smallest effort to show that, in the use of these terms, any new theological sense was being introduced. These words, as all other words on this question, are used simply, without explanation, as words whose sense was long established. Thus our Lord, speaking of himself, says, "This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*:" and again he says, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *never die*."[2] In these passages he implies that they who do not believe in him *shall die*. What our Lord implies of the ungodly, Paul affirms of them: "If ye live after the flesh *ye shall die*."[3] Very frequently repeated are the passages in which the expression *death* is used for future puninshment. Thus our Lord says, "If a man keep my sayings he shall never see death:" Paul affirms of wicked works that their "end is death:" that "the wages of sin is death:" of those who perish he says that to such "we are the savor of death unto death:" James declares that "sin when finished bringeth forth death:" and that "he which converteth a sinner, shall save a soul from death:" John declares that the ungodly shall suffer "the second death."[4] We have thus, in repeated places, death described as the lot of the wicked in the life to come, nor is there in any one of them the least attempt made to show that death had any other than its usual sense, viz: *loss of life*.

Nor can it for one moment be maintained that such explanation was not required if by this death was intended the hitherto unknown sense of life in pain. It may please some of us, with the whole New Testament in our hands, to bring together certain

[1] *Thanatos, apothnesko*. [2] John 6: 50; 11: 26. [3] Rom. 8: 13. [4] John 8: 51; Rom. 6: 21, 23; 2 Cor. 2: 16; James 1: 15; 5: 20; Rev. 20: 14.

UMI

passages scattered here and there, to argue that combined they imply an eternal existence of pain, and that hence death, when spoken of the future of the wicked, must mean an eternal existence in pain. Whatever be their sense, they cannot be urged as obviating the necessity of explaining the term death, and similar terms, if any new sense was imposed upon them. Let us, for example, take the case of the Roman Church when Paul wrote to it. It had the Old Testament, *perhaps* one of the Gospels, probably some two or three of Paul's earlier epistles. Beyond this it had none of the other writings of the New Testament. Now Paul, when speaking of future punishment, always speaks of it here as death, except in one place where he speaks of it as "indignation and wrath and anguish," coming on the sinner from God, and in another as his being "fitted for destruction."[1] Yet he never explains his expression death. Why? Because he used it as it was used at Rome and by Romans, whether they were Christians or unbelievers. If he had used it in any other sense, he must have explained it. Neither Old Testament, nor any one of the Synoptic Gospels, nor any of Paul's earlier epistles, had imposed on the term the sense of life in pain.

As we proceed in our examination of the New Testament we will find ourselves confirmed in our view. To the second death we have given the usual meaning of loss of life hereafter, as death now means the loss of life here. We will now proceed to show that such is the meaning which the New Testament itself imposes on the term. In one place our Lord says, "He that findeth his life shall lose it:" in another he says, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life:" of the wicked, John says they are "not written in the book of life."[2] In these passages two different Greek words are used,[3] but both are certainly used in one and the same sense, viz: *life as opposed to death.* Let us consider the first of these passages. Our Lord affirms of certain characters that in the future retribution they "*shall lose their life.*" What is this life? It is neither spiritual life, nor joy, nor peace with God. These persons never had *this* life, or, if they had, had lost it in the present world. It is simply that *existence here* which they prolonged by their denial of Christ, and which martyrs lost by their confession of Christ. *It is the life which the good and the bad have in common.* It is that which both alike value and would prolong, but which one are content to

[1] Rom. 2: 8, 9; 9: 22. [2] Matt. 10: 39; John 3: 36; Rev. 20: 15. [3] *Psuche, zoe.*

lose for Christ, and which the other will not lose for Christ. That which these have here prolonged for a little while, he says, they shall lose in the future retribution; *i. e., they shall cease to exist.* Christ's words can have no second meaning. And this is agreeable to all Scripture. Eternal life is throughout spoken of as a gift to man through Christ: immortality is described as a blessing to be sought by man as much as the glory and honor of the future state.[1] Neither eternal life nor immortality are supposed to belong to us as our essential possession. Lost in Adam, they are restored in Christ, to be lost a second time by all who will not come to him, that they might have life.

And here we will refer for a moment to a passage in the history of Moses which strongly confirms our view. Moses intercedes with God that Israel may be forgiven, and asks that, if his prayer be not granted, he may be blotted out of the book which God had written.[2] This book can be no other than that book of life frequently referred to in Scripture, in which the names of the redeemed are written.[3] What then did Moses mean by his receiving the doom of sinners, and being blotted out of the book of life? We cannot for a moment suppose that he wished throughout eternity for a life of pain and moral corruption. He could only have wished for the utter cessation of a life which he then felt would be intolerable if his prayer were refused. If this be his meaning, it follows that what he petulantly asked for himself shall actually be the condition of the ungodly, for God in this place declared that what Moses sought for himself he will inflict on them—"Whosoever hath sinned against me him will I blot out of my book."

We now proceed to consider other expressions significant of future punishment. Of these none are so common as the Greek verb and noun[4] translated by the words destroy, perish, destruction. *None are more significant of the utter loss of life.* "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction," saith Christ: and Paul speaks of the ungodly as "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction." Our Lord tells us to fear him "who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell:" and Paul affirms that "they who have sinned without law shall perish without law," that he is a "savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish."[5]

[1] John 10: 28; Rom. 2: 7; 6: 23. [2] Ex. 32: 32, 33. [3] Ps. 69: 28; Luke 10: 20; Rev. 20: 15. [4] *Apollumi, apoleia.* [5] Matt. 7: 13; Rom. 9: 22; Matt. 10: 28; Rom. 2: 12; 2 Cor. 2: 16.

If we go to the Greek lexicon we will find that the terms used in these passages signify primarily *the destruction and loss of life.* For the present we confine our attention to their use in the New Testament. We will find it in strict agreement with the analogy of ordinary Greek writers. Let us take three of the above passages and consider them more particularly. Matt. 7: 13 runs thus: "Broad is the way that leadeth to *destruction*," and the next verse adds, "narrow is the way that leadeth unto *life*." Here it will be remarked that destruction is used as the opposite to life; *i. e.*, as the loss of life. Matt. 10: 28 runs thus: "Fear not them which *kill* the body, but are not able to *kill* the soul: but rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell." Here destroy is used as the equivalent to kill: that which man is able to do to our bodies but which he cannot do to our souls, viz: kill them, that God is able to do in hell both to body and to soul. And here the entire passage shows us that it is the loss of physical life, of existence, that is spoken of. The same connection of destruction with loss of life is seen in 2 Cor. 2: 15, 16: "We are a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that *perish*. To the one we are the savor of *death unto death*." These passages abundantly show us that the New Testament, where it speaks of the destruction of the wicked, follows the general analogy of the Greek language, and means the loss of life in hell.

In exact agreement with the foregoing are the other expressions used in the New Testament. Thus Paul adopts the teaching of the Old Testament as truly descriptive of future punishment, and sums it up in these words, "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and *perish*."[1] The Greek word[2] here translated perish means properly "to become unseen, to disappear and be heard of no more."[3] The whole process is described in these pithy words; unbelievers will first see what they have rejected, will marvel at their folly, and then vanish out of existence.

Another Greek verb and Greek noun,[4] translated destroy, corrupt, perish, destruction, are frequently applied to future punishment, and are, when applied to men, properly significant of their death.[5] We would especially direct attention to the passage in 2 Pet. 2: 12, as affording indubitable proof that it is thus used in Scripture. Speaking of the ungodly, Peter says, "These as *natural brute beasts*, made to be taken and *destroyed*, shall *utterly perish in their own corruption*." The Greek reader will remark that the *same Greek word is used of the end of beasts and of the end of the ungodly.* We know what is the end of beasts taken and destroyed: even such Peter declares will be the end of the ungodly in the future life: *they shall perish there as beasts perish here.*

[1] Acts 13: 41. [2] *Aphanizo.* [3] *Phtheiro, phthora.* [4] 1 Cor. 3: 17; 2 Pet. 2: 12; Gal. 6: 8.

Another Greek term[1] sometimes used for future punishment, and translated destruction, is properly significant of death;[2] the wicked shall be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord."

We have brought forward a variety of phrases from the New Testament. We have now to consider the mighty bearing on their meaning of the fact that this New Testament *is written in the Greek tongue.* In that tongue all these phrases are to be found. Before the Gospel was preached, their meaning was fully established in the cultivated and the common mind of the human race. What is more—they were all in common use, and applied to, and their sense established, *with reference to this very point now under discussion.* The immortality of the soul was not a question for Jewish and Christian thought alone; it was the question of questions for the universal human mind. In particular, it was the question of questions in the various schools of Grecian philosophy. One of the noblest specimens of human reasoning, building its lofty superstructure on uncertain data, that has ever charmed, exalted, and, for our part we must add, bewildered the human intellect, is found in the dying discourse of Socrates to his friends, handed down to a deathless fame in the *Phædo* of Plato. Its object was to prove the immortality of the soul—that it could never cease to be—that through whatever changes it might pass, whatever pollutions it might suffer, whatever fearful torments it might endure, there was the deathless principle of the human soul which asserted an eternal life and utterly refused to die. It could never be, according to Plato, a thing of yesterday, an existence of the past but not of the present, a figure once jotted down in the book of life and then blotted out of it forever. In what terms is the denial of its mortality conveyed? In the very terms in which the punishment of the wicked is asserted in the New Testament. Where this latter says the soul shall die, Plato says it shall not die; where this latter says it shall be de-

[1] *Olethros.* [2] 1 Thess. 5: 3; 2 Thess. 1: 9; 1 Tim. 6: 9.

stroyed, Plato says it shall not be destroyed; where this latter says it shall perish and suffer corruption, Plato says it shall not perish, and is incorruptible. The phrases are the very same, only that what Plato denies of all souls alike, the New Testament asserts of some of the souls of men. But the discussion of the question was not confined to the school of Plato or to his times. Every school of philosophy took it up, whether to confirm Plato's view, or to deny it, or to heap ridicule upon it. All the phrases we have been discussing from the New Testament had been explained, turned over and over, handled with all the power of the masters of language, presented in every phase, so that of their sense there could be no doubt, nor could there be any one ignorant of their sense, before Jesus spoke, or an evangelist or apostle wrote. The subject had not died out before the days of Christ. It never could and never will die out. In every city of the Roman world were schools of Grecian thought in the days of the apostles. In every school the question before us was discussed in the phrases and language of the New Testament. In Jerusalem, and Rome, and Corinth, and Philippi, and Ephesus, and Thessalonica—wherever a Christian preacher opened his mouth to speak to man of his future destiny—were Platonists, or Epicureans, or Stoics, or Alexandrians, to whom the question of the soul's immortality was a question of constant thought, with whom the phrases in which the preacher addressed them as to their solemn future were familiar household words. Their language was his language, whether he spoke or wrote; their terms were his terms, and their meaning his meaning, else there were perplexities without a clue, logomachies without an end. And what did the Christian preacher declare, and the Christian writer write to that world-wide community which was ruled and bound together, not merely by the power of Roman will, but by the sceptre of the Grecian tongue? In sermon and disputation, in gospel and history and epistle and revelation, the propagators of the new religion asserted of the persons of the wicked—*i. e.*, of souls and bodies reunited at the resurrection—that which Plato had denied could happen to any soul. The cultivated intellect of the world, as well as the popular mind, read in the words of Christ, of Paul, of John, of Peter, of James, that what one of its sects of philosophy taught could happen to no soul, and what another taught should happen to all souls, the rising school of the Nazarene taught would happen to those whom its

phraseology described as unjust, wicked, unbelievers. Plato's noble conception, itself but the utterance of the longing of the human heart for its original inheritance, was taken up by the New Testament, only that it had here given to it its true direction, and had the eternal life after which it yearned connected with the God of life manifested in his Son. In Jesus Christ was that life which Plato fancied to exist in the soul itself. This life he would bestow upon his people, realizing more than the conception of Plato. But away from him there was no life. On those who would not come to him there would come finally—after stripes few or many—the end pictured for all by Epicurus. The Gospel brought together the fragments of truth scattered throughout human systems. Those who would soar it raises to God; those who would revel in the sty of sensuality it sinks to the state of the beasts that perish.

We will draw attention to one other phrase of the New Testament significant of future punishment.[1] It occurs in Paul's wish that he "were *accursed* from Christ for his brethren,"[2] a passage affording an exact parallel to the prayer of Moses already referred to. There can be no doubt that whatever Paul here means by being accursed from Christ is that condition in which the ungodly will really be.[3] What then *could* Paul here wish for for himself? Less of him than of almost any man that ever lived are we to suppose that he could for a moment wish for himself an eternal life of blasphemy and moral corruption, for such, according to the theory we are now opposing, is the condition of the reprobate throughout eternity. Far from the possible wishes of his holy mind must such a wish be. We can only suppose him to mean that he could suffer an eternal death, a blotting out of his own name from the book of the living, if by so doing he could gain for his kinsmen the life he had surrendered for himself.[4] This sense is in exact agreement with the use of the term accursed among the Greeks, by whom it was applied to any animal devoted to death, and removed out of the sight of men, in order to avert calamity. We will also find abundant confirmation of our view in the usage of the corresponding Hebrew term *khoram* in the Old Testament, when applied to things devoted to cursing.[5] Utter death where there was life, utter destruction

[1] *Anathema.* [2] Rom. 9: 3. [3] 1 Cor. 16: 22; Alford in Rom. 9. [4] Bengel in Rom. 9: 3.
[5] Deut. 7: 26; 13: 15; Josh. 6: 17-21; 7: 13-25.

UMI

where no life existed, was the end of persons and things thus devoted to a curse.

In exact conformity with our view will be found the illustrations of future punishment in the Old and New Testaments. These are some of the illustrations of the former. The wicked shall be dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel: they shall be like the beasts that perish: like the untimely birth of a woman: like a whirlwind that passeth away: like a waterless garden scorched by an eastern sun: like garments consumed by the moth. They shall consume like the fat of lambs in the fire: consume into smoke: melt like wax: burn like tow: consume like thorns: vanish away like exhausted waters.[1] The illustrations of the New Testament are of the same character. The end of the wicked is there compared to fish cast away to corruption: to a house thrown down to its foundations: to the destruction of the old world by water, and that of the Sodomites by fire: to the death and destruction of natural brute beasts. They shall be like wood cast into quenchless flames: like chaff burnt up: like tares consumed: like a dry branch reduced to ashes.[2] Every one of these images point —not to the preservation of life in any state of pain, but to the loss of life, the utter blotting out of being and existence.

It cannot fail to be remarked how frequently *fire* is described as the agent of future punishment. It can only be taken in one or other of its uses, as the purifier or the destroyer of that submitted to its power. We think its invariable usage forbids us to take it as used as a purifying agent. It is therefore to be taken in its quality of a destroying agent. The power of consuming the thing which feeds its fury is the view of it presented in Scripture. Augustine indeed, in his labored defence of the doctrine of eternal life in hell, ransacks the realms of fact and fiction for substances and life which can resist, and are uninjured by the power of fire. This African Father tells us of worms existing in hot-springs, of salamanders living in the flames, of burning mountains which are not consumed, of diamonds resisting the heat of the furnace.[3] The ingenious idea of another African Father, Tertullian, is that fire as used by man and as employed by God are of quite opposite nature, for that while the former wastes in consuming, the latter repairs the waste which

[1] Ps. 2: 9; 37: 20; 49: 20; 58: 7, 8; 68: 2; Prov. 10: 25; Is. 1: 30; 33: 12; 51: 8.
[2] Matt. 13: 40; Luke 6: 49; 17: 27-29; 2 Pet. 2: 12; Matt. 3: 10-12; 13: 30; John 15: 6.
[3] *De Civ.* 21.

it produces.[1] A truer philosophy corrects this curious defence of African theology. In all God's known world, it tells us, *whatever life is hurt* in fire becomes extinct if continued in it: *whatever substance is injured* in fire is destroyed if it remains. And every one of the illustrations of Scripture refer to substances most readily consumed—to wood, and tow, and thorns, and fat of lambs.

But while we see one universal result, namely: death, to arise from future punishment, we are also told in Scripture of varying circumstances attendant on it which are necessary to be considered, in order to enable us to form an adequate conception of its nature and its variety.

Hell is not to all a sudden cessation of existence. There is life in that fearful prison, though it continues not forever. The children of the kingdom cast into its outer darkness gnash their teeth when they think of those who have come from east and west, and enjoy what they have lost; the unworthy guest at the marriage feast of Christ is in despair that he is not suffered to continue there; the despisers of the offers of redemption, be they Jews or Gentiles, behold their astounding folly, and marvel at its greatness; the unfaithful servant has time to bewail his want of fidelity, and the hypocrite to see that the portion he has chosen is a bitter and a hard one; ere all—sooner or later—sink into that state where wonder and remorse and pain and shame are lulled in the unconscious sleep of the second death.[2]

And here we must remark that all the warnings of weeping and gnashing of teeth are addressed to *the rejecters of proffered grace.* Not one of them is addressed to such as the men of Sodom and Gomorrah, Nineveh and Babylon, were in old times; to such as the men of Cabul and Bokhara, Teheran and Timbuctoo, are at the present day. The same holds good, we believe, of every especial warning found in Scripture.

Now it is doubtless in these circumstances that we will find room for that great distinction in guilt, and consequent punishment which Scripture repeatedly insists on. Its cities of Chorazin and Bethsaida—its children of the kingdom—its refusers of an apostle's message—its hypocrites trading on a false profession—its men aware of their Master's will—are held up as exceeding in guilt the ignorant offender, the undesigning sinner, the rejecter of an unauthenticated messenger, the unconvenanted trans-

[1] *Apol.* 48. [2] Matt. 8: 12; 22: 13; 24: 51; Luke 13: 28; Acts 13: 41.

UMI

gressor, the men of Tyre and of Sidon. For the former are the many stripes; for the latter the few.[1] Our theory, and our theory alone, affords ample room for that great distinction in punishment which God will hereafter make.

And here we find a perfect analogy in the circumstances of the first death. This world is a world of death. All are here doomed to die, and all suffer death. In this there is no distinction. But in the circumstances of dying there is infinite variety. One man lives close upon a thousand years ere he yields to death: to another the first breath he breathes in this world is his last: between Methuselah and the infant of a moment's life lies every variety of duration. Again: one dies as though he were going to rest in sleep; another is racked with pains, year after year, by day and by night, which make him curse the weary life which is so hardly parted from: between these deaths lies every variety of comparative unconsciousness, inconvenience, uneasiness, weariness, and anguish. A like distinction we are positively told will exist in the second death, and our theory affords for it perfect scope. To some this death may be an instantaneous process, a momentary transition from one state to another, like the infant who opens his eyes on this world and then closes them forever. Here may be the amount of conscious pain for the myriads upon myriads of young and old who, in heathen and even in Christian countries from the inevitable moral darkness with which their circumstances had surrounded them, scarce, if at all, knew wrong from right. To others the process of the second death may be more or less lengthened until we arrive at the case of the greatest human offenders, or that more aggravated one of the spirits who fell from heaven and drew weaker man along with them in their fall. In our theory we see how it may be, as it certainly will be, more tolerable for some than for others in the day of judgment; how, while stripes many and sore fall on some, on others they may fall so few and so light as scarcely to be felt at all.

But undoubtedly, in a question of this kind, we may not shut our eyes to any testimony of Scripture. We are reasoning from Scripture as from a book of perfect truth; all whose utterances are equally true. Our argument up to this point has been, we consider, in perfect agreement with the passages brought under notice, simply and naturally understood, and has thus taken in

[1] Matt. 11: 22; 8: 12; 10: 15; Luke 20: 47; 12: 48 John 9: 41.

as perfectly consonant with it a large class of texts very commonly advanced as proving eternal life in hell. Such are all those texts which speak of weeping and wailing, of regrets and anguish, on the part of the damned. Undoubtedly they establish the fact of *life*, but they say nothing of its *duration*. They are consistent with its eternity, but they do not prove it. If any other class of texts establish the fact that life does not continue forever, these naturally fall in with this view, and merely complete the picture. As here life goes before death, and as here regrets and pains precede and produce death, so it may be in the future state.

But there are other texts which are very generally and, we fully admit, with great apparent force advanced, as proving fully, plainly, and unequivocally the doctrine of eternal pain and therefore of eternal life in hell. We must address ourselves to these texts, and see what they do say, whether they are for us or against us. But without any hesitation we assert that the number of texts which thus even seem to establish this view is very small. Mr. Keble's *Litany of our Lord's Warnings* diminishes to a very few petitions when fairly looked at. The figure which advances so portly in the distant obscurity shrinks into the lean and slippered pantaloon when seen close at hand. We have examined, so far as we know, every text in the Old and New Testament which speaks on the subject, and we deliberately say that among them all there appear but *five* passages which can with the smallest show of reason be advanced.[1] Every one of them highly figurative, every one of them veiled or glowing with the imagery of Isaiah or Revelation, it were but reason to interpret them, no matter what appeared to be their meaning, in accordance with the overpowering mass of Scripture testimony which has been advanced for the opposite view. We will, however, examine them in detail. We think they will be found either directly to confirm, or at the least to agree with, our view.

We will first consider Mark 9: 44. Speaking here of hell, and of those who will be consigned to hell, our Lord most solemnly, and with threefold repetition, pronounces their doom —"*their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.*" It is on this text that Augustine, in his *City of God*, mainly relies for his view.[2] It was the text which weighed longest with us in producing a similar conviction. We take it now as teaching the

[1] Is. 33: 14; 66: 24; Mark 9: 43-48; Rev. 14: 10, 11; 20: 10. [2] Book 21: cap. 9.

direct opposite to that which it is so often supposed to uphold. Now for the proof. This solemn declaration of Christ is not an original saying of his, but is quoted by him, word for word, from Is. 66 : 24. What it means in the mouth of Christ is what it meant in that of the prophet, and that we may more readily understand it we will quote it as it is found with its context in Isaiah's prophecy. Speaking of the redeemed of the earth Isaiah says, "They shall go forth, and look upon *the carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me, for *their worm* shall not die, neither shall *their fire* be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." A moment's glance shows us that both the worm and the fire are alike external to and different from the subject on which they prey, and also that what both prey upon *are not the living but the dead.* The fearful image is taken from the worm which feeds upon the carcass, and the fire which consumes it, and conveys the notion, not of life, but of its opposite, death. These most awful words of the prophet endorsed so solemnly by Christ assert a state of eternal death, and not one of eternal life, in hell, as the fate of transgressors in the world to come. They are fatal alike to the theories of Augustine and Origen.

The passage from Is. 33 : 14, if it refers at all to future punishment, is so similar to that just considered, as well as to those which will be considered, that a particular examination of it is not required. We pass on to the passage found in Revelation. These passages are all but identical, the chief difference being the different parties to whom they especially refer. Of the worshipers of the beast we are told in the former that they "shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb: and *the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever:* and they have no rest day nor night:" in the latter passage we are told that "the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and *shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.*"

These are undoubtedly very strong passages. They admit, however, we think, of a sense in perfect harmony with our view. We believe their sense to be this—that the future punishment of all consigned to hell will be of an eternal nature, and that its fearful effect—the plunging of its subjects in death and destruction—will ever remain visible to the sense of the intelligences of God's universe.

Now we will not try to establish this sense by examining the force of each word. We are by no means persuaded that we could in this way convince our opponents. We are not at all sure that language so mystic and figurative is properly capable of this dialectical analysis. We will proceed in another way which we hope will be satisfactory. We will present a passage from another Scripture, couched in equally strong language, in perfectly analogical terms, to which no such interpretation can be given as that attributed by our opponents to those passages in Revelation, but which does bear a sense such as we have put on them above. Our argument is that if one passage is capable of such an interpretation, and has such an interpretation put upon it by the Spirit who inspired it, we may safely allow these to have a similar one, and, reverencing the plainer testimony of other Scriptures, are bound to do so.

The passage we refer to is found in Jude 7: "*Even as Sodom and Gomorrah*, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, *are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" We want to arrive at the sense of this passage. We will first say what this suffering of the Sodomites is not. It does not then, in the first place, refer to anything they suffer, or may be thought to suffer, in *hades*, for of *hades* we know very little; and the condition of the Sodomites in *hades* is never alluded to in Scripture, and is therefore no warning example laid before men to learn from. In the second place, it does not refer to anything they may hereafter suffer in hell, for that is confessedly to them, as to all sinners, a future thing, whereas what the text speaks of is something which they were suffering when Jude wrote, and had suffered before he wrote, and which had long been a plain and palpable warning to ungodly men. If it does not refer to either of these, it is very evident what it does refer to. It means that punishment, open to human sight, which began when the fire from heaven descended on the guilty cities, and which has remained in force through all the succeeding generations down to our own time; and will continue while the present earth remains. *It is their overthrow in the days of Lot, and their abiding condition ever since*, which is here placed before the ungodly as an example of what awaits them hereafter if they imitate

Sodom. This view is not first presented by Jude: it is frequently met with in the older Scriptures. Thus in Deut. 29: 23, the then present condition of Sodom and Gomorrah, "*brimstone and salt and burning, that is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth thereon,*" is held up as the resemblance to which the land of Israel will be reduced if they turn to idols. Similar allusions abound in Scripture.[1] In all of them we find the present unchanging condition of Sodom a favorite image to set forth a like state of similar cities in this life, just as Jude uses it to set forth the unchanging condition of the ungodly in the life to come.

What has been, and is, this state of Sodom? In the days of Abraham four rich and populous cities flourished in the plain of Jordan. On a sudden, fire descended from heaven, and after a period of terror, regrets, and pain, the inhabitants were deprived of life. They and their works were burnt up, and this ruined, lifeless, hopeless condition has remained to the present time. "The smell of the fire is still over the land," says Tertullian. The whole transaction conveys the idea of conscious pain for a time, followed by ruin and death for all time.

In what terms is this condition described? Sodom and Gomorrah—an expression especially including the people of these cities—are described as "*suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.*" They suffered such vengeance in Lot's day, and have suffered it ever since. *It is their eternal suffering from fire.* But when we come to think of the state thus described, what is it? It is not endless life in pain. Pain and life were over in a very short time in the sulphureous fire, but no inhabitant ever woke up to life and enjoyment again, nor were life and enjoyment ever seen again where the destruction fell: death and desolation have ever since reigned there.[2] This is, according to Jude, "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

We will not dwell upon the fact that this description of Jude, expressly stated to afford an example of future punishment, strongly confirms the theory already established. We advance it here as an illustration of Scripture language. The passages in Revelation are not one whit stronger in expression. The phrases "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever," and "they shall be tormented day and night forever," applied to the objects of future punishment, are in no ways more indicative of

[1] Is. 13: 19; Jer. 49: 18; 50: 40; 2 Pet. 2: 6. Josephus. *Jewish War IV.* 8: 4; Wis. 10: 7.

endless life and pain in hell than the phrase "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," applied to the past punishment of the Sodomites, is indicative of their having felt the pain of fire from Abraham's days to ours. The one idea, common and essential to both, is the eternity of the ruin which they bring upon themselves by sin. We will only add that this interpretation put on the passages in Revelation is required in order to bring that book into harmony with itself, since it, like other Scriptures, describes the future condition of the ungodly as a state of death and destruction, as a being blotted out of the book of life.[1]

We are here naturally led to consider what it is that is really meant by the terms eternal fire, unquenchable fire, so often applied to the fire of hell. We are not now considering the nature of the fire itself, whether it be identical with or analogous only to fire such as here consumes. What we are considering is whether, be this fire what it may, it continues throughout eternity to burn as it burns when the reprobates are first placed therein. The passage from Jude leads us to conclude that it only continues to burn *while it has anything to consume.* The fire of Sodom is called an eternal fire, but it only burned while aught remained of the guilty cities to be consumed. It could not be extinguished until then. Jordan poured upon it could not put out its flames; Abraham's prayers could not abate its force; mercy had put forward its last plea in the bosom of God. But when all had been reduced to ashes the fire went out, and the smoke ceased to rise, leaving behind an utter destruction which no lapse of time was to repair. It is thus we are to view the unquenchable fire of hell.

We are to consider that the term is one in common use. It is not confined to hell or peculiar to theology. It is constantly applied to fire burning here on earth, which is unquenchable, inasmuch as all human efforts cannot quench it, but which, when it has done its work of destruction, smoulders away and dies out. The classical scholar will remember the famous passage of Homer were the Trojans hurl unquenchable fire upon the Grecian ships, though but one of them was burnt, and that one only half consumed.[2] In the very same way it is constantly used in Scripture. When God in one place declares that his wrath against Jerusalem "shall not be quenched;" and in another that he will "kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall not be quenched,"[3]

[1] Rev. 3: 5; 11: 18; 17: 8; 20: 6. [2] Iliad 16: 123, 294. [3] Jer. 7: 20; 17: 27.

he means that his wrath was to continue till Jerusalem was destroyed, and the fire was to burn till its palaces were consumed. Then wrath ceased because it had spent its force, and the fire went out because it had eaten up all on which it could prey. So we are to understand that unquenchable fire which is the terrible fate of the lost. *Their fire is not quenched.* It preys upon them with relentless force. No cries on the part of the damned arrest it; no prayers ascend from the redeemed for the sin which they know to be unto eternal death: no further feelings of grace and pity in God's bosom interfere to check its course. It burns on, consuming, preying, reducing, until it has burnt and consumed all. When it has spent its force it dies out for want of food, leaving behind it the endless sign of the destruction which it has brought on fallen archangel, and angel, and man. *This is the second death.* But we can bear to look upon it *because it is death.* We are not looking upon a picture which would overturn reason and banish peace from all who beheld it. Life has left the realms of the lost. The reprobates felt, but do not continue to feel, the consuming flames. These prey upon the dead, and it is dust and ashes which cover the floor of the furnace of hell.

In Origen's view of the future, a view now fast spreading, we see the real cause of the emphatic, repeated, awful declarations of Scripture. That view, so pleasing to fallen human nature, was the idea against which the Spirit of God laid down in Scripture the warnings of everlasting destruction. Experience has proved the wisdom and necessity of this. Even in the face of these Scriptures men are found to advocate the hope of a restoration from hell. Far more than Augustine's theory does the view here maintained root out this false, delusive hope. So long as men believe that life is not extinguished in hell, so long they will nourish hope. They will cherish the idea that somewhere down through the ages, when the groans of hell have been beating sadly, ceaselessly, at the gates of heaven, the message of mercy and deliverance may again be sent down even as God used to send it to Israel of old, groaning beneath the bondage of Egypt, Philistia, and Canaan. Death extirpates all such hopes. God is not the God of the dead.

It has been doubtless remarked, from several expressions in this paper, that we hold that the ultimate fate of devils will be

the same as that of the reprobate. We have no doubt that such is the case, and all Scripture tends to that end. They share in that judgment which awaits the ungodly. The everlasting fire which consumes the wicked is that which has been prepared for the devil and his angels. They themselves look forward to be destroyed in hell. The pains which they dread are those which the ungodly will endure, and which result in death.[1] Nor can one single reason be advanced why God should not do this. The fire which is able to bring to dissolution that human spirit which man's power cannot reach is able also to bring to dissolution that angelic spirit which is probably far more tenacious of life. And we have thus in Scripture a far more satisfactory view of the final state of retribution than is afforded us by popular theology or poetic imagination. Devils are not the tyrants of hell. Devils do not exercise there an endless power over the victims of their fraud. They are only punished in hell with a severity proportioned to their guilt. With fearful reason they look forward to it, not as a scene of further triumph, but of unmitigated wo. They see, in all probability, the world whom they had seduced from God—the greater part of it speedily—all of it at one time or other—reduced to the original unfeeling elements of their being, while their stronger nature retains that vigorous life which makes it but the more susceptible to pain. The last being that retains the misery of existence may be that arch-fiend, Satan, the leader in heaven's rebellion, the prime mover in earth's falling away. When the last race of man has long ceased to feel—when his fellow-angels have, one by one, been reduced to the state of death—he may still survive, longing for the time when he too may lay aside a life which is only one of pain.

The view here advocated derives a further confirmation from its being in complete analogy with nature; i. e., with God's ordinary working. While those who seek God find him, and in finding him find life, and through his gracious plan of redemption are advanced in place and glory, we also find with regard to others lives innumerable lost, and in the case of angels an entire race blotted out of life. God and Nature are not here at strife.[2] If we see in Nature the gradual development of various types of being, we see also the law of death

[1] 2 Pet. 2: 4; Jude 6; Matt. 25: 41; Mark 1: 24; Luke 4: 34; Barn. 21; Justin Martyr. *Dial. Trypho*, pp. 284, 327. [2] Tennyson, *In Memoriam*, 54.

UMI

in ceaseless operation. Of fifty seeds, but one may bear fruit: of the lower animals, death after life is the universal law: whole races of living things have long ceased to exist.

> From scarped cliff and quarried stone,
> She cries, a thousand types are gone.

In our view, God does but apply to higher races for their sin that which he has applied to lower races who knew no sin. The grand distinction between these and us is, that we may see and know God, who is life and the source of all lesser life. If we turn from him we turn from life: we deny and renounce our real distinction, and are treated as that which we have made ourselves to become. In the myriads of human beings reduced in hell to death, in the extinction of the fallen angels, we do but find a particular application of a universal law. Lower creatures know not God, and fade away out of life. Higher intelligences knew him, turned from him forever, or refused to return, made themselves like the beasts, and like beasts are treated. Hell will add its fossil remains to those of the quarries of the earth.

As yet, we have made no use of any considerations arising from the question of Divine justice, either in favor of our own view or as opposed to its opposite. We wished to discuss the statements of Scripture without prejudice. Having done so, we will use this latter argument without any scruple. It is indeed said that we are not able to judge of God's ways, and this, no doubt, is often true; but it is true only of those dealings of his with us, with which we are imperfectly acquainted, or which, from their nature, are above our comprehension. The present subject belongs to neither of these categories. Future punishment is a matter fully set before us. We are told its cause and its nature; told to ponder on and study it. We are not treated as children incapable of forming an opinion as to what is just or unjust in God. Called upon to love, respect, and confide in him, we must be capable of judging of his character, of his love, his mercy, his wisdom, his justice. He has himself appealed to us to do so, appealed, not merely to his faithful people, but to those who are alienated from him.[1] In the human breast, there is a true sense of what is just, and God not only allows it, but insists upon its exercise toward himself. In this question of future punishment, we have the highest case on which any tribunal

[1] Ezek. 18: 29.

shall have ever sat, and we may be sure that the Judge of all the earth will do right, not merely in his own eyes, but in those of all his intelligent creation, of the angels who stand around the throne, of the redeemed who rejoice in their acceptance, of the very damned who listen to their sentence.

What is our question? It is this: Is pain, inflicted through eternity, endured without any hope of an end, no nearer to its close when numberless cycles have passed than when the first groan was uttered? is such pain *a just punishment* for any conceivable amount of sin committed by the worst of men? Man did not ask for life, it was given him without his knowledge or consent. Can any abuse of this unasked-for gift justify the recompense of an eternal existence spent in unending agony?

We must put the question on its proper grounds. The ablest modern defenders of eternal life in hell have put it on a false issue. They have done so in two main respects, urged on by their inability to justify their theory in its naked light. The first of these we will give in the words of William Archer Butler, whose view is adopted by Dr. Salmon in the *Sermons* already referred to. "The *punishments of hell*," says Butler, "are but the perpetual vengeance that accompanies *the sins of hell*. An eternity of wickedness brings with it an eternity of wo. The sinner is to suffer for everlasting, but it is *because the sin itself is as everlasting as the suffering*."[1]

Now it is sufficient to say of this view, that it contradicts the Scripture. Not once, or twice, but over and over again, it tells us that *the punishment of the future is for the sins of the present time*.[2] Man's conduct here, according to the Bible, is the full, sufficient ground for his punishment hereafter. If we think it too great, we are not at liberty to throw in the sins of the future, real or imaginary, to justify the punishment of the future. If we cannot defend man's future treatment as being a just award for his present conduct we cannot justify it at all. It is a piece of cool effrontery for us to present as a reason for God's conduct what God has not presented himself when explaining to man his judicial system.

Nor does it relieve God in the smallest measure from the charge of harshness to say that future punishment will but follow that law of nature which inextricably links together sin and

[1] W. A. Butler's *Sermons*, 2nd series, on *Everlasting Punishment*; Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, p. 10; Dwight's *Theology*, ser. 167. [2] Matt. 25: 41, 42; Rom. 2: 6; 2 Cor. 5: 10.

UMI

misery.[1] We will not allow the believer to shield himself under the cant of modern infidelity. The laws of nature are the laws of God. For all their consequences, after they have worked their uniform work for ages, he is just as responsible as when he first ordained them or as when he departs from them by miraculous interference. If the laws of nature were to bring on the sinner a punishment greater than his sin deserved, it is God himself who would be doing so.

The simple question then is, Could man by any conduct here deserve to suffer through eternity pain and torment to which only the worst pain he suffers here can afford a true parallel? Would the agonies to which the martyr was subjected for an hour be only sufficient for the sinner if drawn out through the eternal age? Would it be just in God to inflict this on any single creature of his hand, on any being who would never have had life at all if the Maker had not called him from his clay? The verdict of the human heart—in its fierce denial—in its secret recoil—answers—No. "Eternal pain," says Augustine, "seems harsh and unjust to human sense." "With the majority of men of the world," says Butler, "this doctrine seems, when they think at all about it, monstrous, disproportioned, impossible." It seems so, in the same writer's mind, to others besides men of the world, to men who do not fear this doom for themselves; it would "blanch the intellect," reduce the mind of the Christian to a state of idiotcy, deprive him of life, were he but adequately to conceive it."[2] If God were now to ask man whether his conduct on this hypothesis were just, man would reply that it was not.

The history of human religious thought shows man's ineradicable sense of the burning wrong of this fearful theory. If Plato taught a *tartarus* with its fiery streams whence none could come forth, he taught it for an infinitesimally small portion of men. For most, even for the homicide, the parricide, and the matricide, he had his Acherusian lake, whence, after a purgative process, they issued forth again to the upper air. If Augustine adopted his great Master's abode of unending pain, he adopted also his purgatory from whence there was a way to heaven. If the Church of Rome has sanctioned the theory of Augustine, she practically holds out its terrors only to those without her pale of safety; for her own millions she has, at the worst, the fires of a finite period. The assertion of Augustine's hell did but drive the gentler mind

[1] Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, p. 9. [2] *City of God* 21 : 12; Butler's *Sermons*, pp. 378, 383.

of Origen to the notion of a wider purgatory than Augustine's, where even devils should be prepared to resume their place in heaven. The prophet of Mecca rejected purgatory, and asserted the hell of Augustine, but this was only for infidels; he had paradise and the houris for the true believers. The churches of the Reformation have generally followed Augustine in his hell and denied his purgatory, but at all times within their bosom has been a struggle against the dominant doctrine, and at best it has only commanded a sullen, uncheerful assent.[1] The modern mind, shaken in religious faith, denies the inspiration of a book which is supposed to teach this monstrous creed. With those who will not throw away their faith in man's future, the theory of Origen, with all its consequences, bids fair, if only confronted with the fearful nightmare of Augustine, to take the place which the authority of the latter father has so long imposed upon the Church. The modern defenders of Augustine's theory shrink from putting forward a vindication of it in its plain and hideous aspect. One after another of the arguments on which it has heretofore been defended they have abandoned as unworthy of their reason, or abhorrent to their sense of justice.[2] Their sole reliance is on some half-dozen texts of Scripture which seem to them to teach it, and these they put forward without daring to say one bold word for the justice of their cause.

Our view needs no vindication, reduces us to no subterfuge to escape its consequences. By it the next life's dealings with the sinner will but follow the analogy of this. He who scans the course of nature may by it anticipate that future course which Revelation opens to our view. According to it *God's ways with the sinner are equal.* They are severe, but they are just. They are full of awe, but they can be contemplated with calmness. Their issue in eternal death, if it brings the sigh of sadness, brings also the deep, full breathing of an infinite relief. We require neither the purgatory of Augustine, nor the universal restoration of Origen. Looking on the calmed face of death we can say—"it is well." The woes, the agony, the despair of life are passed away from its features with the sin that produced them.

We will say but a few words more upon the great moral mystery of the world, *the existence of evil.* We feel we tread in a region of mist and shadow; we will tread slowly and with careful step. We pretend not to account for its origin. We remember,

[1] Dr. Salmon's *Sermons*, pref. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 9, 47.

UMI

in lectures that ought to have been given to the world, that one of the foremost men of the present day gave expression to the thought that the origin of evil must ever remain above the comprehension of the finite mind. But this is an article of our Christian faith, that evil had an origin.[1] It is not from everlasting, else Manichæism were true and not a heresy. It is therefore no essential part of the constitution of the universe. It is not more essential to its future than to its past. If it must be *to* eternity it must have been *from* eternity. It is neither: it is a thing of time. We can imagine the ages to come to roll on ignorant of evil as were those past ages before the archangel fell. It may be that once more it will be the peculiar attribute of Godhead to know both good and evil: the blessedness of creation to know only good. We can imagine evil blotted out. To deny its possibility is to be a Manichee. Do we go too far if we say that if evil *may be* blotted out, *may* cease to defile and to offend, *may* become a thing of the past, *it not only will but must?* We doubt that such a conclusion would be illogical arguing from the premises of this great proposition. Are not all God's attributes, his mercy, his holiness, his justice, his power, pledged to extirpate this evil which lies not beyond his grasp but within his power? *Our belief is that God must do this*—that it is a necessity of that nature of his which has its own binding eternal laws within itself. But we do not insist on this. Other minds may not see the necessity which rises up to our view. But is it not a wonderful recommendation to our view that it teaches that *God will do this, which we cannot deny that he can?* It tells us that hell is not the eternal abode of evil, concentrated in intensity, deepening and darkening in hue throughout eternity. It is not the everlasting exhibition of a scene with whose moral horrors all the sensuality and deviltry and hate and despair that has been exhibited in earth's foulest dens could not compare. The phrenzies of Bedlam, were earth one Bedlam: the despair of suicide, were each one of earth's sons and daughters to resolve on rushing from a hateful life: the hatred of the heart, were each heart to hate as Cain when he stood by Abel in the old field of murder, or the Dominican as he looked with demoniac hatred on the victim he was attending to the flames: could not exhibit even a feeble resem-

[1] John 8: 44.

blance to that which hell would present if Augustine's view were true. Thank God it is not true. God does not contemplate *this* hell. He will indeed gather into it all that offends—all the foul rakings of hate, and pride, and selfishness, and lust. But it is with the ominous purpose of Jehu, when he said "gather all the prophets of Baal and all his priests: let none be wanting," and "the house of Baal was full from one end to another." So will hell enlarge her borders, and the evil of the universe shall descend into it, and fill its wide domain, to be extirpated and blotted out forever.

When or how, or by whom the theory of eternal life in hell was introduced into the theology of the Christian Church, we will not here discuss. It is enough for us to know that, however ancient, it was no part of "the faith once delivered to the saints." We therefore reject it as a fable, a novelty, a monstrous doctrine, worthy of the Koran where it takes its fitting place, unworthy of the Gospel where it finds no place. We leave it to the disciple of Mohammed, lying on his couch of sensuality, to look down with cruel delight upon a scene of unutterable and endless misery.[1] This is not the consummation which the disciples of Christ or the worshipers of the Father of mercies are called on to rejoice in.[2] They could not look on it and rejoice: they could not regard pain as endless without feeling that unalloyed joy could never be their own. What they rejoice in is *the destruction* of the enemies of God, because in their destruction evil and misery are forever banished from God's world, and God reigns supreme in the affection and the loyalty of all that breathe.

From this stand-point we contemplate the final scene of retribution. There is heaven and there is hell. There is eternal life and there is eternal death. The redeemed enjoy the one: the lost are the subjects of the other. The Book of Revelation describes the latter—"Death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."[3] All that has been and continued to be evil: the fallen angels who now move in earth and air; the spirits who are kept in chains of darkness; the multitudes who have died without God and without hope; the multitudes whom the last day will find impenitent and unholy; have all been consigned to one common scene of punishment. According to their deserving is their chastisement. The time for each one's suffering over, he is wrapped in the slumber of eternal

[1] Koran 100: 88. [2] Ps. 68: 10. [3] Rev. 20: 14.

UMI

death. Gradually life dies out in that fearful prison until unbroken silence reigns throughout it. They who would not find life have found death..... That lesson of awe is read and pondered on by all. Doubtless it will be a lesson of mercy to myriads of whom we know nought as yet. But it will be a lesson read without the shudder of anguish. The dead know not anything. They have drunk the waters of Lethe, and forgotten long ago their misery. There is no eternal antagonism of good and evil: no eternal jarring of the notes of praise and wailing. Evil has died out, and with it sorrow. Throughout God's world of life all is joy, and peace, and love.

THE SAINT'S JOY AND SORROW.

"I would to God ye did reign, that we also might reign with you." (1 Cor. 4: 8.) "The days will come," &c. (Luke 17: 22.)

I place together these two verses—the words of the disciple and the words of the Master—as breathing the same spirit. They speak of present pressure and trouble; they point to a day of deliverance and triumph; they indicate the feelings of Christ's Church in this evil day and evil world. Paul means to say, "I wish the time of reigning were really come, as ye seem to think; for then should we share in that glory, instead of being the offscouring of all things;" as if feeling most deeply present trial, and longing for the day when the glory shall be revealed. The Lord means to say, "Days are coming when ye shall long even for *one* of the days of the Son of man; pointing to approaching tribulation, and intimating that under the pressure of this they would long for even one day's relief. Both these passages are written for us, that we might not be overwhelmed with despair as if some strange thing were happening to us, when trial comes down on us as a thick cloud. Taking both verses together, we extract from them such consolations and truths as the following, for the special use of the Church of God.

I. *The pressure of present evil.* There is evil in the world, and there will be till Christ comes. There is evil in the Church. There is sin, confusion, darkness, pain, affliction in many forms, bereavements, persecutions, anxieties, cares, and vexations, poverty, hatred, contempt, with many more such evils. They come on us daily. They press hard on us, and weigh us down. Each

disciple has his own special lot and peculiar trial. Paul felt his deeply; and we must all feel them, for we are not made insensible to sorrow by our becoming believers. The Head felt his sorrows, and prayed, Let this cup pass from me; so the body in all its members feels its sorrows, and "desires one of the days of the Son of man," or "desires to depart to be with Christ," or longs that the day of reigning were come, or wishes to be absent from the body and present with the Lord. "Oh! wretched man that I am," we cry, in reference to the inner conflict. "Wo is me that I dwell in Meshech," we cry concerning the fightings and storms without.

II. *The anticipation of coming good.* This good is called by our Lord the days of the Son of man, in contrast with the present days, which are simply days of man, or "man's day," "this present evil world." It is called by the apostle the time of reigning, in contrast with the present time of down-treading and persecution. These good days are coming, and we fix our hope upon them. They are blessed, and glorious, and endless. They shall reverse everything that is evil now—that pertaining to soul and body, to man and man's earth, to the Church and to the world. It is resurrection that we look for; the times of restitution; a kingdom; new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Then all shall be holy, happy, peaceful; the body glorified, the earth renewed, Satan bound, anti-Christ overthrown, sorrow turned into joy, the cross exchanged for the crown, the tents of Kedar for the New Jerusalem, the wilderness for Canaan, the weariness of the pilgrimage for the everlasting rest.

III. *The desire of relief.* Paul's words express this desire, and Christ's prediction intimates the same thing. We are not expected to be satisfied with pain and sorrow, so as not to long for their removal. We long for deliverance; nay, for the most temporary respite—even for *one* of the days of the Son of man. The burden is at times so heavy that we cry out under it, and wish that the present days were shortened, and the glory hastened. One day's respite would be a great thing for us when overwhelmed at times with evil. But the respite comes not; patience must have her perfect work. There is no sin in the desire, only let it not be impatient. "Not my will, but thine be done."

IV. *The frequent disappointment.* The sky seems for an hour to clear, and then the clouds return after the rain. The sunshine

promises and then passes away. We seem to come within sight of Canaan, and then another range of desert mountains rises up between. The day seems almost breaking, but it breaks not; the shadows seem just departing, but they depart not. Often we say, The long road is ending, the next turn will bring us to its termination; and then, instead, another long stretch of road lengthens out before us. Often we say, Surely this darkness cannot last, this evil must have spent itself; but in vain we thus think. The time is not yet. Often we say, Surely Christ is coming, the reign of crime is ending, the era of holy peace is at hand, the kingdom is going to begin; and then the prospect darkens again, and we seem to hear the voice, "Not yet, not yet." Often we cry, "How long?" and the answer is, "Wait," be patient, stablish your hearts; it will not be long.

V. *The kingdom at last.* These are sure things. They will come at last, though on the back of many disappointments. He that shall come will come, and will not tarry. The signs of the times have often cheated us, but at length they shall be found true. They will introduce the kingdom and the rest. The glory shall break forth; the Son of man shall be revealed; he who is our life shall appear. The ransomed of the Lord shall return with songs; the days of our mourning shall be ended; sorrow and sighing shall flee away.

VI. *The connection between present evil and future good.* Our present light affliction worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. Present evil is the soil out of which the coming good is to spring. Light is sown for the righteous, but it is sown in darkness. It is out of sickness and weakness that our immortal health and strength are to come. The grave is the birthplace of incorruption. It is sown in weakness, and is raised in power. Thus God shall overcome evil with good; out of sin coming holiness, out of our brief sorrow the eternal joy.—*Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.*

Beware of a nominal acquiescence in certain alleged truths, because you have been taught them in your infancy, or because they are the established opinions of those with whom you are connected.... It is the part of a well-regulated mind not only to know the truths, but to know the grounds on which they are believed to be true.—*Abercrombie.*

THE USE AND VALUE OF THE TERM "AION."

By Thomas De Quincey.

The reason which gives to this word *aionian* what I do not scruple to call a *dreadful* importance, is the same reason, and no other, which prompted the dishonesty concerned in the ordinary interpretation of this word. The word happened to connect itself with the ancient dispute about the *duration* of future punishments. What was meant by the *aionian* punishments in the next world? Was the proper sense of the word *eternal*, or was it not? The popular argument may be stated thus: The ordinary construction of the term *aionian*, as equivalent to everlasting, cannot possibly be given up when associated with penal misery, because in that case, and by the very same act, the idea of eternity must be abandoned as applicable to the counter-bliss of Paradise. Torment and blessedness, it is argued, punishment and beatification stand upon the same level; the same word it was, the word *aionian*, which qualified the duration of either; and if eternity in the most rigorous acceptation fell away from the one idea it must equally fall away from the other. Well, be it so. But that would not settle the question. It might be very painful to renounce a long-cherished anticipation, but the necessity of doing so could not be received as a sufficient reason for adhering to the old unconditional use of the word. The argument is, that we must retain the old sense of *eternal*, because else we lose on one scale what we had gained upon the other.

Meantime all this speculation, first and last, is pure nonsense. *Aionian* does not mean *eternal*; neither does it mean of limited duration; nor would the unsettling of *aionian* in its old use, as applied to punishment, to torment, to misery, &c., carry with it any necessary unsettling of the idea in its application to the beatitudes of Paradise.

What then is an *aion?* In the use and acceptation of the Apocalypse, it is evidently this, viz: the duration or cycle of existence which belongs to any existence, not individually for itself, but universally in sight of its genus. Man, also, has a certain *aionian* life, possibly ranging somewhere about the period of 70 years assigned in Psalms. This period in such a case merely

UMI

represents the *aion* of an *individual*; but the *aion* of the RACE would probably amount to many millions of our earthly years; and it would remain an unfathomable mystery, deriving no light at all from the Septuagenarian *aion* of the individual; though between the two *aions* I have no doubt that some secret link of connection does and must subsist, however undiscoverable by human sagacity.

The crow, the deer, the eagle, &c., are all supposed to be long-lived. Some people have fancied that in their normal state they tended to a period of two centuries. I myself know nothing certain for or against this belief; but, supposing the case to be as represented, then this would be the *aionian* period of these animals, considered as individuals. Among trees, in like manner, the oak, the cedar, the yew, are notoriously of slow growth, and their *aionian* period is unusually long as regards the individual. What may be the *aion* of the whole species is entirely unknown. Amongst birds, one species at least has become extinct in our own generation; its *aion* was accomplished. So of all the fossil species in Zoology which Paleontology has revealed. Nothing, in short, throughout universal nature can for a moment be conceived to have been resigned to accident for its normal *aion*. All periods and dates of this order belong to the certainties of nature, but also at the same time to the mysteries of Providence. Throughout the Prophets, we are uniformly taught that nothing is more below the grandeur of Heaven than to assign earthly dates in fixing either the revolutions or the duration of great events such as prophecy would condescend to notice. A day has a prophetic meaning; but what sort of day? A mysterious expression for a time which has no resemblance to a natural day—sometimes comprehending long successions of centuries, and altering its meaning according to the object concerned. 'A time,' and 'times' or 'half a time,' 'an *aion*,' '*aions* of *aions*,' and other variations of this prophetic language are all significant.

Under the old and ordinary view of the Apocalyptic *aion*, which supposed it always to mean the same period of time—mysterious, indeed, and uncertain, as regards our knowledge, but fixed and rigorously certain in the secret counsels of God—it was presumed that this period, if it lost its character of infinity when applied to evil, to criminality, or to punishment, must lose it by a corresponding necessity equally when applied to happiness and the golden aspects of hope. But, on the contrary, ev-

ery object whatsoever, every mode of existence, has its own separate and independent *aion*. The most thoughtless person must be satisfied, on reflection, even apart from the express commentary furnished by the Apocalypse, that every life and mode of being must have hidden within itself the secret *why* of its duration. It is impossible to believe of *any* duration whatever, that it is determined capriciously. Always it rests upon some ground, ancient as light and darkness, though undiscoverable by man. This only is discoverable, as a general tendency, that the *aion*, or generic period of evil, *is constantly toward a fugitive duration*.

The *aion*, it is alleged, must always express the same idea, whatever *that* may be; if it is less than eternity for the evil cases, then it must be less for the good ones. Doubtless the idea of an *aion* is in one sense always uniform, always the same, viz: as a tenth or a twelfth is always the same. Arithmetic could not exist if any caprice or variation affected these ideas—a tenth is always more than an eleventh, always less than a ninth. But this uniformity of ratio and proportion does not hinder but that a tenth may now represent a guinea, and the next moment represent a thousand guineas. The exact amount of the duration expressed by an *aion* depends altogether upon the particular subject which yields the *aion*. It is, as I have said, a radix; and like an algebraic square-root or cube-root, though governed by the most rigorous laws of limitation, it must vary in obedience to the nature of the particular subject whose radix it forms. Meantime, as the summary of what I have written on this topic, accept these three propositions:

1. That man who allows himself to infer the eternity of evil from the counter-eternity of good builds upon the mistake of assigning a stationary and mechanic value to the idea of an *aion*; whereas the very purpose of Scripture in using this word was to evade such a value. The word is always varying for the very purpose of keeping it faithful to a spiritual identity. The period or duration of every object would be an essentially variable quantity were it not mysteriously commensurate to the inner nature of that object as laid open to the eyes of God. And thus it happens that everything in this world, possibly without a solitary exception, has its own separate *aion*: how many entities, so many *aions*.

2. But if it be an excess of blindness which can overlook the

aionian amongst even neutral entities, much deeper is that blindness which overlooks the separate tendencies of things evil and things good. *Naturally, all evil is fugitive and allied to death.*

3. I separately, speaking for myself only, profoundly believe that the Scriptures ascribe absolute and metaphysical eternity to one sole Being, viz: to God; and derivatively to all others according to the interest which they can plead in God's favor. Having anchorage in God, innumerable entities may possibly be admitted to a participation in the divine *aion.*

But what interest in the favor of God can belong to falsehood, to malignity, to impurity?

To invest *them* with *aionian* privileges is in effect, and by its results, to distrust and to insult the Deity. Evil would *not* be evil, if it had the power of self-subsistence, which is imputed to it in supposing its *aionian* life to be co-eternal with that which crowns and glorifies the good.—*Abridged by James H. Whitmore.*

THE RETURN OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND THE HOPE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

"For yet a little while, and he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry." (Heb. 10: 37.)

While the wonder-stricken apostles were looking stedfastly toward heaven after their ascending Lord, two celestial messengers stood by them in white apparel, and addressed them in the following terms: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1: 11.) Henceforth the return of Jesus to this earth became the burden of the apostles' doctrine, and the hope and expectation of the early believers.

Judging from the purport of the bulk of the theological treatises and pulpit discourses of the present day, one would hardly expect that in the New Testament epistles, and the Revelation of John, the second coming is mentioned or alluded to not fewer than sixty-eight times. Yet such is the case.

It is not, however, from the frequency of reference, simply, to this grand event that its importance in the estimation of the apostles and the early believers appears, but also by the earnest and glowing language in which it is invariably mentioned. Thus

Paul, in his letter to the saints at Rome, indicates the intense desire of himself, and of those to whom he was writing, in the following stirring and graphic language: "I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us; for the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the sons of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they, but ourselves also, WHO HAVE THE FIRST-FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT, even *we* groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit: the redemption of our bodies." (Rom. 8: 18–23.) The same writer commences his letter to the church at Corinth by expressing his thankfulness to God on their account, because they came "behind in no gift, *waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,*" who, says he, "shall confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 1: 7, 8.)

It is to the same event the apostle refers in his letter to the faithful in Christ Jesus residing at Ephesus, when he speaks of "the day of redemption," "the redemption of the purchased possession." (Eph. 1: 14; 4: 30.)

Writing to the Philippians, he thus expresses his hope and theirs: "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." (Phil. 3: 20, 21.)

In exhorting the brethren at Colosse to "mortify" the desires of the flesh, he employs this motive: "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." (Col. 3: 3–5.)

Referring, in his first letter to the Thessalonians, to the result of his preaching among them, he congratulates them that it was such as to lead them to "turn from dumb idols to serve the living God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." (1 Thess. 1: 9, 10.) And the object of his earnest prayer that "the Lord would make them to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men," was "to the end that he might stablish their hearts in holiness before God even the Father, at *the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all*

UMI

his saints." (ch. 3: 12, 13.) And when, in the same letter, he administers consolation concerning those who had fallen asleep, the same event—the return of the Lord, and its concomitant results—are the burden of his theme. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others that have no hope; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so those also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent [that is, go before] those who are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 14–17.) To this gathering together of the resurrected and transformed saints to the Lord Jesus, Paul also refers in the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians, in these sublime and soul-stirring utterances: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [that is, we who are alive] shall be changed.... Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

The second letter to the Thessalonians opens with words of encouragement to believers under the severe tribulation they were called on to suffer for the truth's sake. It is a promise of "rest"—rest to the troubled—a rest which the righteous Lord would award to them "when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of his Son, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all those that believe." (2 Thess. 1: 7–10.)

When near the close of his career, we find the same apostle committing a solemn charge to Timothy, his own son in the faith, which he introduces and enforces in these terms: "I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word," etc. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight,

I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but to all them also that *love his appearing.*" (2 Tim. 4: 6, 7.) "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men," says the same writer in his letter to Titus, "hath appeared; teaching us that, denying ungodliness and wordly desires, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior, Jesus Christ." (Titus 2: 12, 13.) It is thus evident that the second appearing of the Lord Jesus was a subject of the greatest moment to the apostle Paul, and to the churches of the saints to which his letters are addressed.

The same fact characterizes the letters of the other apostles preserved to us in the New Testament. Hear James: "Be patient, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." (James 5: 7, 8.) Hear Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto *salvation ready to be revealed* in the last time; wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, you are in heaviness through manifold trials; that the trial of your faith being much more precious than gold, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, *at the appearing of Jesus Christ.* Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought to you *at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" (1 Peter 1: 3–7, 13.)

Listen to John: "And now, little children, abide in him, that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed at his coming." "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear [that is, it is not yet manifested] what we shall be; but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is; and every one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." (1 John 3: 28; 4: 2.)

UMI

Once more: Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, testifieth that "Enoch, the seventh from Adam," made the following prophetic announcement: "Behold, *the Lord cometh* with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14, 15.)

There is another fact in relation to the teaching of our blessed Lord and his apostles, and the faith and hope of the first believers, to which we would also call attention, namely: *that the appearing of the Lord Jesus, and the gathering together of the saints to himself, was an object not only of desire, but also of* CONSTANT EXPECTATION. This has appeared in some of those passages already quoted, and is clearly stated in many others, such as the following: "Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light." (Rom. 13: 12, 13.) "You [Corinthians] come behind in no gift, *waiting* for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. 1: 7.) "The Lord direct your hearts into the patient waiting for Christ." (2 Thess. 3: 5.) "Of the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write unto you, for you yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others, but let us watch and be sober." (1 Thess. 5: 2–6.) "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." (Phil. 4: 5.) "He that testifieth these things saith, Surely, I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus." (Rev. 22: 20.) The constant *waiting* and *watching* for the coming of the Lord was based on the fact *that they did not know how soon he might appear.* That they did expect his speedy appearing is manifest; but how soon it might be they knew not. The Lord Jesus himself said that he would come suddenly—like a flash of lightning—and that the *time* of his appearing was hid from men and angels, yea, even from himself. "Therefore," says he, "watch, for you know not at what hour your Lord doth come." (Matt. 24: 36–44; Mark 13: 32–37.)

There is one passage which is often cited against the idea we are now illustrating, namely: 2 Thess. 2: 1–12—"Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in

mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand," &c.

One writer on the second coming of the Lord[1] avers that the apostle here "fearlessly crushes" the idea that "the day of Christ was at hand," and that no "pre-millennialist would employ the language of the apostle, as he would be afraid of destroying the possibility of watching." (pp. 42, 43.) Now, whatever be the meaning of the apostle's language here, it is a fact that he tells the Christians at Rome that "the day is at hand;" and, that this idea was not peculiar to him, but was taught also by the other New Testament writers, we have already had ample proof. Can it be that the apostle here seeks to "destroy" what he and his fellow-apostles commonly taught? No such thing. The mistake arises from a wrong translation of the Greek word rendered "at hand."

The term used in Rom. 13: 12 [*eggiken*] is, undoubtedly, correctly translated, "at hand." "And that knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is AT HAND: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light." The same word is frequently so rendered in the New Testament; but this is far from being the case with the term employed in 2 Thess. 2: 2 [*enesteken*]. It is never in any other instance rendered "at hand" by our translators; and in several instances they render it "present," in opposition to "future," or "coming." Observe its use in the following passages:

"For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things PRESENT, nor things to come, nor hight, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. 8: 38.)

"Therefore let no man glory in men, for all things are yours: whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or things PRESENT, or things to come; all are yours." (1 Cor. 3: 21, 22.)

"I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the PRESENT distress." (1 Cor. 7: 26.)

"Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this PRESENT evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." (Gal. 1: 4.)

"Which was a figure for the time then PRESENT, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did

[1] *Christ's Second Coming: Will It Be Pre-millennial?* By the Rev. David Brown, D. D. formerly of St. James' Free Church, Glasgow, now of Aberdeen, Scotland.

UMI

the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience." (Heb 9: 9.)

"Present," not "at hand," is evidently its meaning here. The sense of the passage, and the uniform testimony of the apostles, demand this. So rendered, the passage runs thus: "We beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of the Lord, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit or by letter as from us, that the day of Christ is present;" that is, already come.

It was not to crush their hopes, or allay their "feverish enthusiasm," regarding the speedy appearing of their glorified Redeemer, that the apostle wrote those words of caution, but contrariwise, to prevent their being "shaken in mind"—to quiet their fears that the day of the Lord was already present. Nothing short of the greatest misconception of the earnest desire, hope, and expectation of the early Christians could lead any one for a moment to imagine that the church of the Thessalonians had any reason to be "troubled" because the day of Christ was at hand: for was it not at "that day" that the holy apostle expected to receive from his Savior's hands "a crown of righteousness"—a crown that shall be awarded not to him alone, but to all those also who love that Savior's appearing?

But, on the other hand, the notion which some men appear to have been at pains to teach the brethren at Thessalonica—the notion that the day of Christ had already come, while the brethren who had fallen asleep had not awaked, but were slumbering still, and they themselves yet unchanged, and all things remained as formerly, afforded cause for their being troubled and shaken in mind—it is to remove this idea, or to prevent its being believed, that the apostle employs the language in question.

Viewed in the light of the context, this passage, so far from destroying the possibility of watching, is in perfect harmony with those other Scriptures we have cited; and from what has been advanced, it is trusted the reader will clearly perceive that THE SECOND APPEARING OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST WAS A MATTER OF INTENSE DESIRE, EARNEST HOPE, AND CONSTANT EXPECTATION TO THE APOSTLES, AND THE CHURCHES TO WHICH THE EPISTLES ARE ADDRESSED.

And so it was also regarded by the church down to the beginning of the fourth century. Justin Martyr, who lived within thirty years of the apostle John's death, testifies that in his time, the return of the Lord to reign on the earth was received by all true Christians, and denied by none but those who denied the resurrection. Says Madame Gasparin:

"The whole primitive church expected the coming of Christ, and believed in his temporal (*i. e.*, his personal) reign. This belief, so strong and firm in apostolic times, faded in proportion as faith lost its early simplicity. Men took to materializing precepts, and spiritualizing prophecy, and thus truth got modified on both sides."[1]

The late Dr. Chalmers, toward the close of his days, expressed the same hope and expectation:

"Above all, let us wait for the coming of the Son of man; and let my constant attitude be that of one who looketh for the Savior." Again, "Meanwhile let us wait for the coming of the Lord, who will destroy all adversaries, and will dissipate every darkening influence by the brightness of his appearance. I desire to cherish a more habitual and practical faith than heretofore in that coming which even the first Christians were called to hope for with all earnestness.... How much more we who are so much nearer to this great fulfillment than at the time when they believed!"[2]

And now, dear reader, permit the question, How stands it with you? Do you love the appearing of the Lord from heaven, and live in continual longing and expectation of his coming? If not, then you have not the hope of the early church, which is indeed "the hope of the gospel." For unless that same Jesus return from heaven to deliver us from death and the grave, and endow us with immortality,... there is no gospel of salvation, my dear friend, for you or me, or any son of Adam. Search the Scriptures, and see if it be not so. Was not the "kingdom of God" the grand theme of the preaching of Jesus and his apostles? And did not Jesus intimate that "this gospel of the kingdom should be preached in all the world?" And is not the record of this preaching in such terms as these: "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women?" How, then, can you have the "faith of the gospel as once delivered to the saints?" Unless you are con-

[1] *Near and Heavenly Horizons*, p. 266. [2] *Sabbath Scripture Readings*, vol. I., pp. 108-211.

UMI

vinced of the truth concerning the kingdom of God, as predicted by Moses and the prophets, and preached by Jesus and his apostles, how can you love the appearing of him who is Jehovah's Christ or Anointed for that kingdom? And if you love not his appearing, where is the ground of your confidence for acceptance with him? Ponder, I beseech you, these words: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and UNTO THEM THAT LOOK FOR HIM shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." (Heb. 9: 28.) Unto them that *look for* him, is the promise of salvation here given. Most assuredly, that same Jesus, who is gone into heaven, shall return to earth; and his return shall seal our eternal salvation or everlasting destruction. Either we shall be made like him, and see him as he is, or be smitten to death by the breath of his mouth; for "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all them that believe." (2 Thess. 1: 7–10.) "Be ye therefore ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh."—*Rainbow.*

"ASCENSION ROBES."

"A great multitude.... clothed with white robes." (Rev. 7: 9.)

Adventists have ever loved to dwell upon the passages from the Revelator's vivid pen where he describes the great company he saw in vision, wearing white robes, with palms of victory in their hands. To be one of that company is to attain all that God has promised to fallen man through our Savior.

> "We have heard of the robe, and the palm, and the crown,
> And the silvery band in white,"

and we love to talk and sing of them. And we not only love to talk of them, but we understand the imagery, and can talk of them understandingly.

In the palm, we see the emblem of victory, eternal victory over mortality and death. Long captives, we shall then see the power that has triumphed over the saints since Abel's fall, bound with his own fetters. After every other enemy, and all evil, has passed into the eternal oblivion of the second death, then, pierced with his own dart, "the last enemy shall be destroyed."

The crown we look for is a crown of life, of life eternal; for it fadeth not away. It will be given when the Chief Shepherd shall appear. (1 Pet. 5: 4.) It means a change from mortality to immortality. It means a body fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body, incapable of death.

And we look for "a robe," indeed, as Jesus has counseled us to do, that we "may be clothed, and the shame of our nakedness do not appear." (Rev. 3: 18.) This garment is described in Scripture phrase, as of "fine linen, clean and white, which [dropping the metaphor] *is the righteousness of saints.*" (Rev. 19: 8.) But right here we remember the prophet's words, that "all our righteousnesses are as *filthy rags.*" Surely this does not refer to the clean, white linen of the promised robe. No, this is the clothing of the sinner: it is of a piece with the righteousness attainable by the law; it is self-righteousness.

Paul tells us of a righteousness which may become ours by appropriation, and which is free to all. After setting forth his own righteousness, which afforded so much ground for confidence in the flesh, he says: "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but *that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:* that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." (Phil. 3: 8–11.)

This is our expected robe. To none wearing this will it ever be said: "Friend, how camest thou in hither not having on a wedding garment?" That robe entitles the wearer to be caught up, or ascend to meet the Lord in the air, to enter through the gates into the city to the marriage of the Lamb, and so may, adopting the language of our assailants, very properly be called an "ASCENSION ROBE." Blessed is he that hath this robe of rare virtues; for all without it will be left on the outside when the

door shall be shut, and mercy clean gone forever, to realize their loss, and, gnashing their teeth, with weeping and wailing, melt away, and be as though they had not been.

Upon the basis of the frequent expression of our hope to receive this robe, with palm and crown, our opponents, both in and out of the church, have constructed not a few scandals; and among the most senseless of these are those we may call the "ascension robe" stories. Doubtless it would be stooping for us to notice them in these pages, were it not for the fact that the falsehood has been put on enduring record, for the little while time may last, in works to which the public turn with confidence for correct information on the topics presented.

The New American Encyclopædia, published by the Appletons, of New York, and edited by Charles A. Dana and George Ripley, has given a character to this libel which will cause many to believe it true, spite of any testimony we could bring to the contrary. Yet, this authoritative and generally accurate work, and popular notions to the contrary notwithstanding, we challenge the proof *that any Adventist, ever, anywhere, under any circumstances, prepared an "ascension robe."*

It may be asked, What is an "ascension robe?" An "ascension robe" is, according to the tongue of scandal, a long white garment, sometimes simply a sheet wrapped around the body, in which it is said that Adventists have arrayed themselves from time to time, in the expectation that thus attired they would "go up" to meet Christ at his coming. Who originally told the falsehood, or set it afloat, it is now impossible to say. It was doubtless, as we have already intimated, suggested by the frequent references to the expected "robe" in our meetings; and was eagerly taken up by the religious and secular press, by the pulpit, and individuals, and circulated for the purpose of fostering and creating prejudice against us, in which it has largely succeeded. Indeed, such success has attended the circulation of slanders, misrepresentations, and exaggerations by opponents, aided by the blunders of some true, and the misconduct of some false brethren, that *prejudice* is now the greatest obstacle to the spread of our views.

But we remarked that *The New Encyclopædia* had indorsed this scandal, and recorded it as a historical fact. We will give its statement, found in vol. XI., p. 510:

"MILLER, WILLIAM. Founder of the sect of Millerites, or Second Adventists. Died in Low Hampton, N. Y., Dec. 20, 1849. ....His early facilities for education were slight, and he seems never to have been master of what are usually deemed the requisite resources for Biblical criticism. But in 1833 he began to lecture upon the speedy second coming of Christ, announcing in accordance with his interpretation of the prophecies that the earth was to be destroyed[1] in 1843. Even the day was specified, if not by himself, by some of his principal followers. His earnest and confident manner attracted attention; his Scriptural and historical argument seemed to many erudite and cogent, and after a few years of constant travel and preaching his disciples were reckoned at 30,000 to 50,000. They belonged not only to the United States, but to British America and Great Britain; and had a weekly organ, *The Advent Herald*, published in Boston, and still continued by the Rev. J. V. Himes. After the failure of the prediction in 1843, the interpretations of the leaders of the sect varied somewhat; but several different years and days were successively designated for the termination of all things; and in some localities the Millerites more than once attired themselves in white, and stationed themselves in graveyards and on the roofs of houses, waiting for the appearance of the Lord. The sect still exists, but with greatly diminished numbers, and holds that the second advent of Christ is near, without claiming to be certain of the precise date."

That nothing might be wanting to complete the injustice of this sketch, *the first part* of it was sent, in the proof-sheets, to *The Advent Herald* office in Boston, for correction as to dates and minor details. As it stood, it was as fair an account of the Advent movement as could be expected from those having no sympathy for it. But *the allusion to ascension robes was not in those proof-sheets;* it was added after the information asked for was received from *The Herald* office. What motives influenced the editors of that great work to publish a scandal calculated to create prejudice against us, without giving an opportunity for refutation, we will not undertake to define; certainly they were not of a very high order. And unfortunately for their credit for accuracy in dealing with an unpopular movement, they have contradicted themselves in their record of us. After stating, as quoted above, that the Adventists, once numbering from 30,000 to 50,000, "still exist, *but with greatly diminished numbers*," the editors of *The Encyclopædia*, in vol. XIV., p. 484, say: "They

[1] It is singular how our opponents will persist in ascribing to us the doctrine of the destruction of the earth, instead of its renewal. True, we teach its destruction as to its present conditions; but the burden of that thought, even, is that the destruction is only the first step in the process of cleansing and renewal.

have now four or five periodicals, and number near, or quite 160,000 members, in the United States, British America, and Great Britain." In one volume we have "greatly diminished" in numbers; in another our numbers are trebled!!

The attention of the publishers of *The Encyclopædia* was called to these errors years ago; but it still continues to bear false witness against us.

Another work which circulated this fiction, with others, of which it could not even be said that they were "founded on fact," was Belcher's *History of Religious Denominations.* We endeavored to procure a copy in order to quote its misstatements to our readers, but failed to do so. But while preparing this article, our attention was called to a work entitled *Christ Coming in His Kingdom—Millennarianism Refuted*, by one Wm. B. Orvis, like Mr. Belcher, a "Rev.," Mr. Orvis being a professed minister of the gospel among the Congregationalists; Mr. Belcher's denominational relations we do not recall.

Before quoting any of Mr. Orvis' allusions to Adventists, we will give an extract from his "parting word" to critics and readers. "We have," he says, "aimed to treat the subject and all who differ with us with *all possible* candor and charity, and hope to be so treated by readers and critics in return." How much of "candor and charity" it is "possible" for Mr. Orvis to exercise in dealing with an opponent, is illustrated in the following quotation (italics ours):

"HOW OFT' WILL ADVENTISTS BE ROBED FOR A BODILY ASCENSION?

"It would seem that after reacting a few times more, the grotesque scenes of the past few years would become repulsive scenes, in which thousands of adventists[1] looking for a materialized, and sense-observed coming of Christ, in the fogs of our atmosphere, have built their balloons (as at this hour they are said to be doing in the city of New York), and have enshrouded their bodies in their *ascension robes, as they termed them*,.... have gone out into the fields, and with bewildered gaze, and with frantic speech, song, and gesture, have thus waited for Christ to reappear, as they would look for an æronaut to descend from the clouds in his balloon. How oft, may we well ask, shall such farcical scenes be re-enacted?"

This is a paragraph worthy of that reliable historian of the

[1] It will be observed that Adventists is spelled with a small "a," which is supposed to be a withering expression of contempt.

times, "Q. K. Philander Doesticks," whose sketch of "the Millerites" was so widely published a few years ago. We think however that "Doesticks" is the more consistent of the two writers. Let us analyze Mr. Orvis' statements. 'THOUSANDS of Adventists have built their balloons'—what has become of them all? Where were they filled? out in "the fields?" If so, from what source? But beside this, 'they have enshrouded their bodies in their *ascension robes, as they termed them*, [!] gone into the fields, and *there* waited for Christ as men would watch for an æronaut to reappear.' Here they are in the fields, with their balloons, and attired in their "ascension robes," but instead of 'going up,' they remain in the fields, making no use whatever of their balloons. How much more dramatic, and *quite as near the truth*, to have pictured them as entering the balloons at the appointed hour, and, "enshrouded" in their robes, cutting loose from earth, "going up" with "frantic speech, and song, and gesture!" Mr. Orvis should learn to better preserve the unities of his fanciful delineations.

But, to be serious, we appeal to the candid reader, if the above quotation from a "Congregationalist minister" does not on its very face betray a deliberate determination to slander the Advent people. We cannot avoid the conviction that he knew he was uttering a false statement when he penned that paragraph—to say nothing of many other misstatements in his book—and sent it forth to the world. *The Christian Union* says that his book "has all the marks of insanity." We are inclined, for charity's sake, to adopt that view. Certainly we feel no sentiment but that of pity for this traducer of the people and cause we love.

But how can the tales of "ascension robes" be demonstrated to be false? We answer, *by pressing those who utter them for the proof.* We have heard many tell the story in public and in private, but never yet met the person who dared say that they, themselves, had seen an Adventist attired in an "ascension robe." When closely pressed they could only affirm, they "*had heard it on good authority.*" The manner in which the scandal-mongers deal out this ware from the budgets is well illustrated in the following letter from Br. A. Penfield, late of Washington, which was published in *The Advent Herald* some years since, as follows:

"I have been much interested in reading the *Notes of a Colporteur.* In his No. 11, he is confronted by an allegation that a certain young woman of the village made an ascension robe—cloth

bought at a certain store, &c. The Colporteur desired to go and see the young woman, who lived but a short distance, and offered $100 if two good witnesses would say that she ever made the robe; but the parties making the statement would not go. He then offered $100 a piece for every person proved to have made such a robe. This was declined. The Colporteur adds: 'I have found many lie-lovers on these things, and some of them in the pulpit.'

"Three or four years since, a Baptist minister of Cleveland being possessed of much 'popularity,' gave notice that he should preach on the subject of the Second Advent. A large part of the sermon was devoted to the consideration of ascension robes, etc., and a labored effort made to call forth a smile and a laugh. It was painful in the extreme to listen where there was no opportunity of replying. I however wrote him a letter, informing him that the walls of the same house, if they could speak, would testify with what intense solemnity listening crowds inside and out (the windows being opened) heard on the great subject in by-gone days. Though I did not offer money if he would prove that such robes had been made, I did say that till he furnished such proof I should consider him a tale-bearer. I never heard from him. Yet he baptized monthly after this in his congregation. How can such things be? I ask myself."

We once heard a Methodist minister in the town of Champlain, N. Y., in the course of a historical sketch of his society in that place, indulge this calumny. At the close of the sermon we challenged him as a Christian minister to either prove or retract his assertion. But he declined to do either the one or the other. Large pecuniary or other rewards have been offered, even by advertisement in the public papers—and many of these offers *are still standing*—for the proof that any Adventist ever wore an "ascension robe." But it cannot be proved; it is in the very nature of the case wholly impossible that it should be true.

We remember some three or four years since a Free Will Baptist preacher in New Hampshire issued a little pamphlet against us, filled with sneers, invective, and calumny, in which he revived the "ascension robe" story. We offered if he would prove that any Adventist, anywhere, ever prepared or wore an "ascension robe," we would furnish him, free of cost, 1,000 copies of his pamphlet for every instance established. And we now repeat, what we have said before, that *no Adventist, ever, anywhere, under any circumstances, prepared, or wore an "ascension robe."* Let the venders of this slur upon Adventism be pushed for the proof of their story; and if they decline or fail to furnish

it, and also refuse to retract, let them stand exposed as tale-bearers,[1] taking up a reproach against their neighbors,[2] speaking evil[3] against their brethren, who equally with them trust in Christ for salvation.

We do not deny that there has been fanaticism connected with the Advent movement; but if this condemns us, which of the sects that oppose us is to "cast the first stone?" and what becomes of Christianity itself! The apostles had to contend with fanatics; and so has every Christian reform since their day. This is a misfortune, not a crime.

To our Advent brethren we say, Let us not be ashamed of our hope! The white-robed throng of the Apocalyptic vision was composed of *tried* men and women. They had not only known reproach, but many of them had been called to suffer as we never may be. The saints of other ages had trials peculiar to their times. Ours are the last-day perils; not the prison, torture, sword, and flame; but association with those bearing the form of godliness, while denying its power: pleasure lovers: spiritual evils in high places. We cannot doubt that "the last days" are upon us; and if so, the time is near when the dead in Christ shall arise. *Then* we which are alive and remain shall be CAUGHT UP together with them to meet our Lord in the air. And blessed, indeed, they that shall then have already, prepared from the fine linen, clean and white, which is the righteousness of the saints, AN "ASCENSION ROBE."

EDITORIAL.

We think our readers will enjoy the table we have set for them in this number of THE QUARTERLY; though we have had to depend more upon 'selections' than we wished to. Some of our brethren who promised us the aid of their pens in sustaining THE QUARTERLY have been so pressed with calls for labor in another department—preaching the Word—as to be unable to furnish the essays we expected from them. We are able, however, to promise articles in our next number from John Couch, Wm. Sheldon, Frank Burr, and James H. Whitmore, by whose help, with that of others who have made partial promises, we hope to make the closing number of our first volume the best and most interesting.

The article in the present number which will attract most attention is

[1] Lev. 19: 16. [2] Ps. 15: 3. [3] Titus 3: 2.

UMI

that by Henry Constable, on future punishment. We commend it to the critical attention of all our readers. Mr. Constable has made his mark in Great Britain as a writer upon this topic, and we hope to have our pages still further enriched by his pen. The close reader will observe the point where he diverges from the view commonly held by Adventists; his position being quite identical with that of Prof. Hudson. But this does not weaken his scriptural argument—and the basis of his argument is purely scriptural—he has presented. His reasoning is a two-edged sword: it cuts down Universalism or Restorationism, while it demolishes the dreadful system elaborated by Augustine. It is so complete and conclusive a defence of the doctrine of the final extinction of sinners, and, indeed, of all evil, that we feel sure none will object to its length.

The rational and only scriptural theory of future punishment is gaining ground in Great Britain, and its advocates are greatly encouraged, though the reformation has not as yet acquired the proportions of a revolution in theological opinions. Still Mr. Constable is able to say in a recent private letter to us—"I think great progress is making in this country in overturning Augustine's theory of punishment; and my opinion is that in a few years it will cease to be generally held." We are sorry that we cannot express such a strong hope for theological reform in this country, though, indeed, our views are making considerable progress.

The view of man's nature taken by our English friends is not so radical as that held by the Adventists. English destructionists generally hold that the spirit survives the death of the body, the two being reunited in the resurrection, when man comes to judgment: and then, when the second death seizes the sinner, destroying soul and body in *gehenna*, he ceases to be.

This view does not trench so strongly upon theological prejudices as do our 'materialistic' ideas. *It lets men down easier:* but we doubt its strength and effectiveness, either for defense or attack, as compared with the Advent position. After examining all the arguments on this topic that have come under our observation, we fail to find evidence that man has even a *mortal* immaterial soul, or spirit, which as a conscious entity survives in death. To us the Bible represents the dead as without hope save in the resurrection—but we see not how this can possibly be true if there is a part of man, in which consciousness resides, that survives in death. This is called *materialism*. Be it so: we are not to be frightened by words. It is *Christian* materialism—it is *Bible* materialism. It has neither part nor lot with the infidelity of that school of philosophers with which our assailants strive to confound it, hoping thereby to bias the public mind against us. And, unfortunately for the truth's sake, they are quite successful in their efforts in this direction. But this difference in views does not abate our interest in our English brethren. We watch their progress against the tide of opposition, obloquy, and reproach, with the sympathy which can be felt by those only who have suffered the same things. We trust, in turn, that our differences will prove no bar to a return on their part of the interest and sympathy we profess.

"Father Miller," as Adventists call him, was no ordinary man. But as the generation who knew him personally are fast passing away, we desire to put on record a brief sketch of his life and character from a source which cannot, to say the least, be accused of a prejudice in his favor. We copy from *Littell's Living Age* an obituary notice, originally published in *The Boston Atlas*, in December, 1849, on the occasion of the old man's decease. It is an opponent's tribute of respect to a man greatly abused and maligned:

"Mr. Miller, of Low Hampton, N. Y., somewhat celebrated for his views respecting the nearness of the advent, died at his residence on Thursday, the 20th inst., in his 68th year.

"He was born at Pittsfield, in this State, February 15, 1782. When he was four years of age, his father removed to Low Hampton, Washington Co., N. Y. At the age of twenty-two, he settled in Poultney, Vt., and was a deputy sheriff for that county. On the commencement of the late war with Great Britain, he received a captain's commission in the U. S. army, where he remained till the peace. He took part in the action at Plattsburg, where 1,500 regulars, and about 4,000 volunteers, defeated the British, who were 15,000 strong. After the close of the war, he removed to the place of his late residence, where for several years he held the office of a justice of the peace.

"Mr. Miller was regarded with much affection by his neighbors, who esteemed him as a benevolent, intelligent man, and a kind neighbor. For many years he was a most assiduous student of history and the Scriptures, in the study of which he became impressed with a conviction that the fifth monarchy predicted by Daniel to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, under the whole heaven, for an everlasting possession (see Dan. 7), was about to be consummated. It becoming known that he entertained these views, he was importuned by many to write out his opinions, and afterwards to defend them in public. After refusing so to do for many years, he at length complied, and has been principally known to the public as a lecturer on prophecy. He thus describes his reluctance to appear in public, and the occasion of his first attempt:

"'One Saturday, after breakfast, in the summer of 1833, I sat down at my desk to examine some point, and as I arose to go out to work, it came home to me with more force than ever, "Go and tell it to the world." The impression was so sudden, and came with such force, that I settled down into my chair, saying, "I can't go, Lord." "Why not?" seemed to be the response; and then all my excuses came up, my want of ability, &c.; but my distress became so great, I entered into a solemn covenant with God, that if he would open the way, I would go and perform my duty to the world. "What do you mean by opening the way?" seemed to come to me. Why, said I, if I should have an invitation to speak publicly in any place, I will go and tell them what I find in the Bible about the Lord's coming. Instantly all my burden was gone, and I rejoiced that I should not probably be thus called upon, for I had never had such an invitation. My trials were not known, and I had but little expectation of being invited to any field of labor.

"'In about half an hour from this time, before I had left the room, a son of Mr. Guilford, of Dresden, about sixteen miles from my residence, came in and said that his father had sent for me, and wished me to go home with him. Supposing that he wished to see me on some business, I asked him what he wanted? He replied, that there was to be no preaching in their church the next day, and his father wished to have me come and talk to the people on the subject of the Lord's coming. I was immediately angry with myself for having made the covenant I had; I rebelled at once against the Lord, and determined not to go. I left the boy without giving him any answer, and retired in great distress to a grove near by. There I struggled with the Lord for about an hour, endeavoring to release myself from the covenant I had made with him, but I could get no relief. It was impressed

that by Henry Constable, on future punishment. We commend it to the critical attention of all our readers. Mr. Constable has made his mark in Great Britain as a writer upon this topic, and we hope to have our pages still further enriched by his pen. The close reader will observe the point where he diverges from the view commonly held by Adventists; his position being quite identical with that of Prof. Hudson. But this does not weaken his scriptural argument—and the basis of his argument is purely scriptural—he has presented. His reasoning is a two-edged sword: it cuts down Universalism or Restorationism, while it demolishes the dreadful system elaborated by Augustine. It is so complete and conclusive a defence of the doctrine of the final extinction of sinners, and, indeed, of all evil, that we feel sure none will object to its length.

The rational and only scriptural theory of future punishment is gaining ground in Great Britain, and its advocates are greatly encouraged, though the reformation has not as yet acquired the proportions of a revolution in theological opinions. Still Mr. Constable is able to say in a recent private letter to us—"I think great progress is making in this country in overturning Augustine's theory of punishment; and my opinion is that in a few years it will cease to be generally held." We are sorry that we cannot express such a strong hope for theological reform in this country, though, indeed, our views are making considerable progress.

The view of man's nature taken by our English friends is not so radical as that held by the Adventists. English destructionists generally hold that the spirit survives the death of the body, the two being reunited in the resurrection, when man comes to judgment: and then, when the second death seizes the sinner, destroying soul and body in *gehenna*, he ceases to be.

This view does not trench so strongly upon theological prejudices as do our 'materialistic' ideas. *It lets men down easier:* but we doubt its strength and effectiveness, either for defense or attack, as compared with the Advent position. After examining all the arguments on this topic that have come under our observation, we fail to find evidence that man has even a *mortal* immaterial soul, or spirit, which as a conscious entity survives in death. To us the Bible represents the dead as without hope save in the resurrection: but we see not how this can possibly be true if there is a part of man, in which consciousness resides, that survives in death. This is called *materialism*. Be it so: we are not to be frightened by words. It is *Christian* materialism—it is *Bible* materialism. It has neither part nor lot with the infidelity of that school of philosophers with which our assailants strive to confound it, hoping thereby to bias the public mind against us. And, unfortunately for the truth's sake, they are quite successful in their efforts in this direction. But this difference in views does not abate our interest in our English brethren. We watch their progress against the tide of opposition, obloquy, and reproach, with the sympathy which can be felt by those only who have suffered the same things. We trust, in turn, that our differences will prove no bar to a return on their part of the interest and sympathy we profess.

"Father Miller," as Adventists call him, was no ordinary man. But as the generation who knew him personally are fast passing away, we desire to put on record a brief sketch of his life and character from a source which cannot, to say the least, be accused of a prejudice in his favor. We copy from *Littell's Living Age* an obituary notice, originally published in *The Boston Atlas*, in December, 1849, on the occasion of the old man's decease. It is an opponent's tribute of respect to a man greatly abused and maligned:

"Mr. Miller, of Low Hampton, N. Y., somewhat celebrated for his views respecting the nearness of the advent, died at his residence on Thursday, the 20th inst., in his 68th year.

"He was born at Pittsfield, in this State, February 15, 1782. When he was four years of age, his father removed to Low Hampton, Washington Co., N. Y. At the age of twenty-two, he settled in Poultney, Vt., and was a deputy sheriff for that county. On the commencement of the late war with Great Britain, he received a captain's commission in the U. S. army, where he remained till the peace. He took part in the action at Plattsburg, where 1,500 regulars, and about 4,000 volunteers, defeated the British, who were 15,000 strong. After the close of the war, he removed to the place of his late residence, where for several years he held the office of a justice of the peace.

"Mr. Miller was regarded with much affection by his neighbors, who esteemed him as a benevolent, intelligent man, and a kind neighbor. For many years he was a most assiduous student of history and the Scriptures, in the study of which he became impressed with a conviction that the fifth monarchy predicted by Daniel to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, under the whole heaven, for an everlasting possession (see Dan. 7), was about to be consummated. It becoming known that he entertained these views, he was importuned by many to write out his opinions, and afterwards to defend them in public. After refusing so to do for many years, he at length complied, and has been principally known to the public as a lecturer on prophecy. He thus describes his reluctance to appear in public, and the occasion of his first attempt:

"'One Saturday, after breakfast, in the summer of 1833, I sat down at my desk to examine some point, and as I arose to go out to work, it came home to me with more force than ever, "Go and tell it to the world." The impression was so sudden, and came with such force, that I settled down into my chair, saying, "I can't go, Lord." "Why not?" seemed to be the response; and then all my excuses came up, my want of ability, &c.; but my distress became so great, I entered into a solemn covenant with God, that if he would open the way, I would go and perform my duty to the world. "What do you mean by opening the way?" seemed to come to me. Why, said I, if I should have an invitation to speak publicly in any place, I will go and tell them what I find in the Bible about the Lord's coming. Instantly all my burden was gone, and I rejoiced that I should not probably be thus called upon, for I had never had such an invitation. My trials were not known, and I had but little expectation of being invited to any field of labor.

"'In about half an hour from this time, before I had left the room, a son of Mr. Guilford, of Dresden, about sixteen miles from my residence, came in and said that his father had sent for me, and wished me to go home with him. Supposing that he wished to see me on some business, I asked him what he wanted? He replied, that there was to be no preaching in their church the next day, and his father wished to have me come and talk to the people on the subject of the Lord's coming. I was immediately angry with myself for having made the covenant I had; I rebelled at once against the Lord, and determined not to go. I left the boy without giving him any answer, and retired in great distress to a grove near by. There I struggled with the Lord for about an hour, endeavoring to release myself from the covenant I had made with him, but I could get no relief. It was impressed

upon my conscience, "Will you make a covenant with God, and break it so soon?" and the exceeding sinfulness of thus doing overwhelmed me. I finally submitted; and promised the Lord that if he would sustain me, I would go, trusting in him to give me grace and ability to perform all he should require of me. I returned to the house, and found the boy still waiting; he remained till after dinner, and I returned with him to Dresden.'

"From this time and onward he was pressed with invitations to present his views in many places, and traveled extensively throughout the Northern, Eastern, and Middle States, and Canada, and labored almost constantly for the succeeding twelve years; but visited no place without first receiving an urgent invitation.

"He was disappointed in the fulfillment of his expectations in 1843,* and came out the next year with an *Apology and Defence*, acknowledging the want of accuracy in his chronological calculations, but claiming that the nature and nearness of the event was still sustained by scriptural evidence. In that belief he has since lived and died—worn out with the infirmities of age.

"He was a man strictly temperate in all his habits, devoted in his family and social attachments, and proverbial for his integrity. His brain was of large volume, and he was capable of great mental efforts. He was naturally very amiable in his temperament; but when he thought he was unjustly represented, he often indulged in biting sarcasm on his revilers. His mental faculties were clear to the last, and he fell asleep joyful in the hope of a speedy resurrection."†

WE could find no more choice words to fill out and close the present QUARTERLY than the following beautifully expressed thoughts, by the Editor of *The Rainbow*, concerning the present foretaste of our future perfect and eternal rest:

"Leaving entirely out of view for the moment all denominational peculiarities, and the different conclusions to which men have come respecting the future of the church and the world, it is refreshing to think of the glorious center of all divine life and hope—the Lord Jesus Christ. In him there is rest for the weary heart amidst the trials of the world, and the storms that agitate, and rend, and are likely at no distant day to overwhelm the nominal church. Happy is the man who has personal knowledge of this most blessed rest. He may be sorely tried in any or many of the manifold forms in which trials come; and, keenest pang of all! his loyalty to the Lord he loves, may be doubted, simply because that very loyalty has compelled him to reject as spurious certain notions that pass current in the churches as verities of divine revelation; but his refuge is certain, his place of shelter from the storm is sure, he comforts himself in the Lord, and leaves his cause with his God.

"And with relation to the great future, there is rest in Christ. Complicated, intervolved, mysterious as all things seem to be, the infinite wisdom of our blessed Redeemer will arrange and settle every thing so as to call forth the wonder and praise of the intelligent universe. All will yet be pronounced very good by One who cannot err, and the concurrent testimony of men and angels will echo the glorious declaration. It cannot, it will not be otherwise; let us therefore calmly, quietly, lovingly REST IN CHRIST."

* In all his published works he always stated the time as "about 1843."—*Ed. Atlas.*

† We heard "Father Miller" preach on this great subject, to an immense audience, one night in Philadelphia. His evident sincerity, earnestness, and simplicity attracted to him our high respect. We think the success which marked his labors, notwithstanding his want of learning even upon his chosen subject, arose from his bringing prominently forward a neglected truth. And it is to be feared that his confident and ill-founded predictions as to time will throw temporary discredit upon the great burden of many prophecies—the second coming of our Lord.—*Ed. Liv. Age.*

THE

Advent-Christian Quarterly.

VOL. I.—APRIL, 1870.—NO. IV.

IMMATERIALISM; OR, SOUL-IMMORTALITY REFUTED.

By ELD. WM. SHELDON, Brodhead, Wis.

The Bible introduces the theme of immortality, and presents the matter in its true light; but instead of representing a part of man as already immortal, and destined to outlive the body, as a separate personality, it treats of "*mortal man*" (Job 4: 17), and never intimates that there are *two personalities* composing what we call man, the one the exact duplicate of the other, the one visible and the other invisible, the one mortal and the other immortal; but it treats of man as a *unit*, having a soul and spirit, but not in the sense of *personalities*. Neither the soul or spirit are ever pronounced immortal.

We will briefly examine all the statements of the Bible concerning immortality, and thus learn what its teachings are upon this topic.

1. "Now unto the King eternal, IMMORTAL, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." (1 Tim. 1: 17.)

Here the great truth is distinctly stated, that the supreme God is immortal. All believe this.

2. "The blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, who only hath IMMORTALITY, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." (1 Tim. 6: 16.)

In Rev. 19: 16 we read of the return of Christ from heaven, bearing this inscription, "King of kings, and Lord of lords;" and Paul speaks of him as now "dwelling in the light," and pre-

UMI

sents him as the "ONLY" one from the human race who "*hath immortality*," or the only one from the ranks of men yet immortalized: "Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more" (Rom. 6: 9): he is now immortal.

3. "Who [Christ] hath abolished death, and hath brought life and IMMORTALITY to light through the gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 10.)

Death was abolished in the person of Christ at his resurrection, and he bore away the keys; eternal life was then for the first time conferred on man—"the man Christ Jesus"—and immortality was then imparted, and exhibited in the resurrected person of Christ; for, says John, "the LIFE was *manifested*, and we have *seen* it, and bare witness, and show unto you that ETERNAL LIFE which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." (John 1: 2.) Though Christ was once possessed of a dying nature, and did die, he was not only released from the grasp of death, but was made *deathless*: "death hath *no more* dominion over him." (Rom. 6: 9.)

4. "Who [God] will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life." (Rom. 2: 7.)

Here man is represented as destitute of immortality, and is told how he may availingly seek for it. God will render eternal life to the faithful seeker, at some future time, when mortality shall be succeeded by immortality; for while mortality may be the basis of a short life, nothing short of immortality can be the basis of endless life.

5. "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on *immortality*. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on *immortality*, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." (1 Cor. 15: 52–54.)

Here the term immortality occurs twice, and is applied to the condition of the saints at their resurrection. In no other text in the entire Bible can the term be found. This is just *what* the Bible says on this topic, and *all* it says. In brief, we are informed (1) that Jehovah is immortal; (2) that Christ is the only one yet immortalized from the ranks of mortals, and is now dwelling in the realm of light, to which mortal man never gained

access, and will in due time show himself in the capacity of the "*only Potentate*" due the world, in which capacity he has never been "seen" by mortal man; (3) that Christ not only abolished death in his own person, at his resurrection, but brought endless life, and an immortalized existence after death, to light, not theoretically, but practically, by exhibiting himself as the "*first-fruits*;" which fact is set forth "through the gospel;" (4) that man may "seek" for immortality by "well doing;" (5) that the righteous will receive immortality at the resurrection.

This is the unperverted theology of inspiration on this topic. Any conflicting theory, no matter how popular, is unreliable, speculative, and both *un*scriptural and *anti*-scriptural.

The prevailing sentiment among modern theologians, that the human soul or spirit is immortal, is without foundation in reason or scripture; and more than this, it clashes with both philosophy and revelation. Who can believe without *evidence?* and who can believe *contrary* to evidence? It is *weakness* to believe without evidence, and *rashness* to believe contrary to evidence. Where is the evidence that the soul is immortal? What prophet ever affirmed it? What apostle ever declared it? What inspired witness ever pronounces it immortal? Not one. The Bible uses the term soul 840 times without once pronouncing it immortal; and why is this? Man is represented as possessing both a *soul* and a *spirit*—two distinct things, and not two names for one thing: for we read of "the dividing asunder of soul and spirit" (Heb. 4: 12); and of "your whole spirit and soul and body" (2 Thess. 5: 23): so that the spirit is as really distinct from the soul as the soul is from the body; and the claim that the soul is a *personality* would also make the spirit a personality as really as the soul—thus locating two personalities within each man.

While we freely admit that the Bible often speaks concerning the soul *of* man, and the spirit *of* man, we deny that a *personality* is meant in a single case. Spirit *as* a personality (as in the case of God, angels, demons, and also when used as a synonym of man) is one thing; but the spirit OF a personality is a different thing altogether; for while God, *as a spirit*, is a personality, who would be wild enough to affirm that seven personalities are indicated by "the seven spirits OF God?" (Rev. 3: 1.) There is just as much authority for pronouncing the seven spirits *of* God seven distinct personal deities, as for pronouncing the

UMI

spirit *of* man a personality distinct from man. If the "seven spirits *of* God" are so many influences or elements, instead of so many personalities, why insist, without proof, that the spirit OF man indicates an invisible personality within the body? This error arises from confounding spirit *as a being* with the spirit OF a being. Who does not know that the sun *as a light* is different from the light OF the sun? In the first case, reference is made to a *body*, and in the second case to something residing in or proceeding from the body.

So "soul" AS *a personality* is a different thing from the soul OF a personality. Let this point be understood, and it will save much needless confusion and speculation.

The term soul is often used as a synonym of "*life*," and "*mind*;" but neither life or mind are personalities. The Hebrew term *nephesh*, from which soul is translated in the Old Testament, is rendered *life* in the singular and plural form 120 times. The Greek term *psuche*, from which soul is translated in the New Testament, is rendered *life* 40 times in the singular and plural forms. Life is not a personality, but the principle within the personality that causes the personality to live.

The original word translated soul is sometimes rendered "*mind*;" but mind, instead of being a personality within man, is only a result of a living organism. Mind is feeble in infancy, which could not be the case if it were an immortal personality: as that which can be *increased* can also be *diminished*; and that which can be diminished in the *least degree* can be reduced to *non-existence* by the same principle, which cannot be true of immortality. Mind becomes childish in old age, or becomes impaired by disease, and is often deranged, and finally dies: "in that very day his *thoughts perish*." (Ps. 146: 4.) These philosophical and scriptural facts clearly negate the assumption that the mind is immortal, even if it were a personality; but this fact, with the fact that mind is not a personality, sweeps immortal-soulism into oblivion.

Life, not being a personality, cannot have a separate conscious existence, even though it is often called soul, as in Job 12: 10—"In whose hand *is* the *soul* of every *living thing*;" and in Prov. 12: 10—"A righteous man regardeth the life [*nephesh*, soul] of his beast." If life is a personality in man, it must also be in beasts.

Mind, not being a personality, could not have an independent

conscious existence, even if it were deathless; but add to this the fact that it *does die*, and the supposition of its immortality expires.

"*Soul*" is a term used not only in the foregoing senses, but also as a synonym of *person*, liable to die, and sleep in the grave, as in these texts:

"All they that go down to the dust, shall bow before him: and none can *keep alive* his own *soul*." (Ps. 22: 29.)
"Thou hast delivered my *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 56: 13.)
"He spared not their *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 78: 50.)
"Let my *soul live* and it shall praise thee." (Ps. 119: 175.)
"The eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him,....to deliver their *soul* from *death*." (Ps. 33: 19.)
"My *soul* chooseth strangling and *death* rather than my life." (Job 7: 15.)
"The *soul* that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18: 4.)
"Eight *souls* were saved by water." (1 Pet. 3: 20.)
"Every living *soul died* in the sea." (Rev. 16: 3.)
"What man is he that liveth and shall not see *death*? Shall he deliver his *soul* from the hand of the grave?" (Ps. 89: 48.)
"O Lord, thou hast brought up my *soul* from the *grave*." (Ps. 30: 3.)
"His *soul* draweth near unto the *grave*." (Job 33: 22.)
"He will deliver his *soul* from going into the pit." (Job 33: 28.)
"Thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered *it* from the pit of corruption." [Is. 38: 17.]
"God will redeem my *soul* from the power of the *grave*." [Ps. 49: 14.]
"Deliver my *soul* from the sword." [Ps. 22: 20.]
"They smote all the *souls* that were therein with the edge of the sword: utterly *destroying* them." [Josh. 11: 11.]

Many similar texts might be quoted in opposition to the doctrine of soul-immortality.

But I may be informed that man has a spirit which may be immortal, even if the soul is not. We fully believe that man has a spirit, but do not believe that it is a personality within him. Spirit AS *a personality* is different from the spirit OF a personality, as before shown. In Eccl. 3: 21 we read concerning "the spirit OF man," and also "the spirit OF the beast," and all this in the same text; and the original word *ruach* is used for spirit in both cases—"*ruach* OF man" and *ruach* OF the beast:" and more than this, it is affirmed of men and beasts in v. 19 of the same chapter, "They have all ONE *ruach*." The spirit of the one is as really an invisible being as the other. If "the spirit of the beast" is an element, the spirit of man cannot be a *personality*, as they have "ONE *ruach*"—one in *kind*. An element must be

UMI

intended in both cases, or an organized being in both cases. The latter conclusion would involve the existence of a world to come for ghosts of all sorts of animals. We read that "the spirit shall return to God who gave it (Eccl. 12 : 7); but did God give it as a *personality?* If so, it will return to God as a personality; but if it came from God as an *element*, it will return as an element. In the record of man's creation, we learn that after man was formed out of the dust of the ground, God "breathed into his nostrils *the breath of life*," or "the spirit of life"—not an entity, to distinguish him from the beasts, but something as really possessed by the animal creation as by man, in proof of which we read: "And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is *the breath of life* from under heaven." (Gen. 6 : 17.) "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is *the breath of life*." (Gen. 7 : 15.) "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beasts, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils is *the breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land died." (Gen. 7 : 21, 22.)

Thus we learn (1) that the only spirit that is to return to God is the spirit that God "*gave*" man; (2) that the only spirit that God gave man at his creation was "the breath of life," or "spirit of life;" (3) that the animal creation also possess the "breath of life;" hence, to assume that it means an *entity*, instead of an *element*, in the case of man, is virtually to admit the same in the case of the animal creation. We have already seen that the mental spirit, or human mind, being a result of the physical organization, and not a super-added entity, lives and dies with the human organism. It is not a personality in men, God, nor angels.

We are often referred to texts that speak of "giving up the *ghost*," as though a *personal* ghost were meant—the very thing to be *proved*, instead of being *assumed*. That the giving up of the ghost is synonymous with *dying* is evident (1) from the fact that in the Old Testament, the original from which "gave up the ghost" is translated, is sometimes rendered "*died*," and by other equivalent words; (2) in the New Testament, *ghost* and *spirit* are both from the same original term; and we have already seen that the spirit *of* a man is not a personality, but a life-producing element, which man yields up in death; so "the body without

the spirit is dead." This is the only kind of ghost to be delivered up by man in death. A *personal* ghost is a creature of imagination.

We will now notice some of the many

EVIL RESULTS OF IMMORTAL-SOULISM.

As "a tree is known by its fruits," it may be well to examine the fruit of this great tree of theology; and if we find it bearing *evil* fruit, and *only* evil fruit, and also a *large quantity* of evil fruit, we shall be safe in pronouncing it an evil tree. Who will object to this conclusion? and who will object to the examination? Certainly no Christian, and no honest man *should* object for a moment. It will avail nothing to insist, previous to examination, that it is a good tree, simply because some honest but mistaken friends have long pronounced it good, which friends also agree with us that certain fruit is evil, ignoring the fact that the very fruit which they pronounce evil grows on the very tree which they call good and grows on no other tree in the wide world. We read of "twelve manner of fruits" on the tree of life—all good fruits, too—but this tree of immortal-soulism yields a larger variety; more than twelve kinds; but each variety is bitter and evil. It must be obvious to every unbiased person that a tree yielding such a *quantity* of evil fruit, and also such a *variety* of evil fruit, cannot be a good tree. Let us, then, enter into an examination, not for the purpose of learning whether certain species of theological fruit is really evil, or not, but to determine whether this fruit, which we all agree in pronouncing evil, really grows on this tree of immortal-soulism, and whether this fruit could ever have existed provided this *tree* had never been in existence.

I. *Catholicism* is one of the fruits of this tree.

1. No one would ever be so foolish as to pray to the Virgin Mary in heaven, unless first led to believe that she is alive in some sense after passing through the terrors of death; and knowing that her body is dead, they have *assumed*, without proof, and contrary to facts, that her soul was immortal, and soared to heaven. If it is true that the Virgin is alive, and in heaven, why not petition her to intercede with the Redeemer for us? Who can reasonably object? In this world we ask the saints of God to pray for us, and if those saints really live after death, and go to heaven where God is, and live in his immediate

UMI

presence, where they cannot regard iniquity in their hearts to prevent their prayers from being heard, it would be perfectly proper to petition them to pray to God for us. Let not Protestants denounce this practice while claiming that the Virgin is alive: for such Protestants are more inconsistent than the Catholics. They insist that the tree which yields the fruit is good, but pronounce the fruit evil; while the Catholics say that both the tree and the fruit, in this instance, is good; though even Catholics themselves, in other cases, are compelled to pronounce some of the fruits of this tree evil.

But we pronounce both the tree and its fruits evil. *We* do not pray to the Virgin in heaven, because she is not there, but in the grave. We do not importune her to pray for us, because she is dead and cannot pray. Teach Catholics that Mary is dead, and they would pray to *God*, rather than to a dead virgin. Teach them the Bible doctrine, that the heaven to be enjoyed by the Virgin Mary, and all the other saints, is on the other side of the resurrection and judgment, and that Mary *herself*, instead of a ghostly shade, will be there, and that all the saints will be there as glorified personalities, and not as mere shadows, dressed in garments of moonshine; then they will desist from the practice of praying to an imaginary female ghost. But let not folly rebuke foolishness—let not Protestants, who claim that Mary has turned into a personal ghost, rebuke Catholics for praying to such a being.

2. No one would ever be foolish enough to pay the priest the last dollar to pray the ghost of a deceased friend out of purgatory, were it not for immortal-soulism. This fruit grows only on that tree. Let the fact be understood that death kills the entire man, and that he must remain dead till the resurrection, and that no *entity* or *personality* leaves man at death, but simply an *element* called the *spirit of life* returns to God who gave it, and Catholicism, with its ghostly purgatory, would become obsolete.

II. *Mohammedanism* is another fruit that grows on the tree of immortal-soulism.

1. Just establish the Scriptural fact in the minds of all men that death *kills* men, instead of subtracting ghostly entities, or spirit personalities, from them, to inhabit some other world, and no one could ever have been deceived by Mahomet's story of riding on a ghostly horse, from earth up through seven ghost-heavens, where he saw and conversed with Noah, Abraham,

Adam, and others. But instead of being deluded by this theological nonsense, they could have met him with the claim, these men are dead, and not alive; and in their graves instead of being in heaven.

2. Mahomet taught his soldiers that if they died on the battle-field, Paradise should be theirs, and that they should have "girls of Paradise" for wives, in addition to their former wives; thus assuming that at death, the immortal souls of little girls go to Paradise, there to become the ghost-wives of ghost-soldiers of Mahomet. Who could ever have believed this dogma without first believing immortal-soulism? Obliterate this doctrine, and Mohammedanism is obsolete. Fruit cannot grow after the tree is killed; and the way to prevent people from eating poisonous fruit is to kill the tree that yields it: then it will not furnish the fatal poison. Is it right to keep the tree thriving, and call it a *good* tree, while it is the only tree that exists which yields such poisonous fruit, which has already poisoned its millions on millions?

3. Mahomet taught that there were not only seven heavens for good ghosts, but seven hells for evil ghosts—that there was a narrow foot-bridge, "finer than a hair," stretched from this world over these seven ghost-hells, reaching to heaven, for ghosts to walk over on: thus each ghost must become a practical wire-walker. A good ghost gets on to the bridge, and walks over hell No. 1, which is intensely hot; then over hell No. 2, which is very hot, but not so hot as the first; then over hell No. 3, which is hot, and like the other two, full of wailing ghosts, but not so hot as the others; then over hell No. 4, which is far from being a cool place; then over hell No. 5, which is a little cooler, but hot enough to burn human beings, if there were any there, but as only ghosts are there, and as they cannot burn up, nothing is consumed; then over hell No. 6, which is still cooler, but not in danger of freezing over; then over hell No. 7, which is the coolest hell in the catalogue; then he lands on the shore of heaven No. 1, where, if he is only an ordinarily good ghost, he must stop, and consider himself at home; if however he is a superlatively good ghost, he passes on through heavens Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and makes No. 7 his home.

A superlatively wicked ghost tries to walk this bridge, and as soon as he gets fairly over the center of hell No. 1, his foot slips, and he falls into the hottest hell of the seven. Another very

UMI

wicked ghost tries to walk this bridge, not being quite as wicked as the other, and succeeds in walking over hell No. 1 in safety, but, alas! when he gets fairly over the center of hell No. 2, his foot slips, and down he goes into the fire. Another wicked ghost tries to walk the bridge, and passes over the first hell, and the second, but just as he gets over the center of hell No. 3, he tumbles into it. And thus, according to their grades of wickedness, they find a corresponding hell ready to receive them, the most wicked falling into the first, the next grade into the next hell, and so on to the end of the list, there being seven grades of ghosts, and seven hells to receive them.

This speculative nonsense never could have been believed by any living man, had not a belief in the immortality of the soul paved the way for its reception. When it is proved that death *kills* men, and that they cannot live again till the resurrection, this doctrine of a ghostly existence in a heaven of ghosts, or in a hell of ghosts, cannot be believed. Root up the tree, and we shall soon get rid of the fruit. It is labor lost to curse the fruit, and bless the tree that yields it.

III. That peculiar and obnoxious fruit called *Mormonism* also grows on this tree of immortal-soulism; and we had rather disown the tree than to own the fruit—a kind of fruit that can grow on no other tree. Hence, if we make the fruit evil, let us not eulogize the tree that produces it.

1. Mormonism originated in the claim that the ghost of a dead prophet, by the name of Maroni, who once lived on this continent, appeared to Joseph Smith, and revealed to him the whereabouts of certain plates of gold, said to contain the substance of what is now found in the Book of Mormon. If the devil had really tried to imitate God in making a Bible, and after having finished it, felt so much ashamed of it as to bury it in the ground, that ghost must have done a very naughty trick in telling "Joe" where to go and dig it up; and certainly a good ghost would not teach any man to dig up a bad book. If ghostly personalities leave men when they die, who can say that "Joe" never talked with a ghost? But if death really kills men, then down goes Mormonism.

2. One corner-stone of Mormonism is the claim that the ghost of John the Baptist ordained Joseph Smith to the priesthood of the Aaronic order. If it did not kill John the Baptist to cut his

head off, but merely subtracted a personal ghost from him, who can prove that this ghost did not ordain "Joe?" It is easy to say, "I don't believe it," but that does not disprove it. But if the act of severing a man's head from his body actually *kills* the man, instead of letting him out of a mortal prison, then John never ordained "Joe" Smith, for dead men cannot ordain people.

3. Another corner-stone to this system of Mormonism is the claim that Joseph Smith was ordained to the Melchisedec priesthood by the ghosts of Peter, James, and John. Now if they were possessed of personal ghosts while living, and if at death these ghosts flew away from the body, who knows but what they did ordain "Joe?" While alive they had power to ordain men; and if, instead of being dead, they are still alive, as personal ghosts, who can say they cannot now ordain men? "Joe" says they are alive; and so do you; "Joe" says they ordained him; you say you don't believe it; but your unbelief disproves nothing. But take the Bible position—"The dead know not anything" (Eccl. 9: 5); and that "there is *no work*, nor *device*, nor *knowledge*, nor *wisdom* in the grave [*sheol*—THE STATE OF THE DEAD] whither thou goest" (Eccl. 9: 10)—and Mormonism wilts and dies before it. Take away the doctrine of a personal ghost in man, and Smith's ghostly ordinations are *proved* (not *guessed*) to be hypocritical claims, and the superstructure built upon this foundation falls to the ground at once.

IV. "*Necromancy*," so strongly denounced in the Bible, is another fruit which grows on this mighty tree of immortal-soulism, whose shade fills the world, and whose branches extend to the ends of the earth. This tree is not only a large tree, but an old one. The acorn from which it has grown was planted by the devil, in the garden of Eden, nearly 6,000 years ago: "*Ye shall not surely die.*" It was only a little shrub at first, without branches; but in process of time its branches began to shoot out, one after another, till these great branches of Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, and various other *isms* not only grew vigorously, but filled the earth with their evil fruit. But the first branch was "necromancy," or a *pretended* consultation with the dead. If this practice had been a reality, instead of being a mere deception, God would never have forbidden it; for if our friends are really alive, our intercourse with them would be for our benefit, and God never forbids that which is for our

UMI

good; but "necromancy" being of Satanic origin, in disguise, God forbade the deceptive practice.

V. *Transmigration* is another fruitful branch of this tree. It claims that the man proper survives the stroke of death, and passes into some other person, or into some animal, and lives in that tabernacle till released again by death, then goes into another, &c., &c. That is, a man may die to-day, and to-morrow his deathless soul may dwell in a mouse; but the cat soon comes along, and liberates the captive by killing the mouse; next day this same soul resides in an elephant, which dies in process of time, thus liberating the captive once more: but it soon finds a home in the whale, till the sailor's harpoon sets him free, when he enters a human body again, and so on, experiencing change after change. Let it be fairly understood that death *kills man entirely*, instead of unsheathing a personal ghost to live elsewhere; and that all the ghost that man gives up at death is the "breath of life," or spirit of life, which instead of being a personality within a personality is only an *element* producing life in a personality, which once came from God as an *element*, and not as a personality, and is to return to God again just as it came from him, as an element, and not as a personality, and all this transmigrationism, and its kindred *isms*, would go out of existence. Death ends life, instead of reviving it; and only the resurrection can recommence it, at the appearing of the Life-giver.

VI. *Hero-worship* is the bitter fruit growing on another branch of this tree. Let the fact be believed, that death *kills* heroes, and all other men, instead of unhousing ghostly personalities, and sending them off to some remote realm, and no one would ever have engaged in this species of worship, as millions have done for centuries.

VII. The Indian, fancying that death, instead of ending his life, will simply subtract a spirit-Indian from his body, tickles himself with the silly notion of chasing the spirit-deer in a "happy hunting-ground." And why not come to the conclusion that if death takes a live Indian out of a dead one, that it just as really takes a live *deer* out of a dead one? Observation favors the latter idea as strongly as the former. And the same Bible that speaks of the "spirit of man," speaks as plainly of the "*spirit of the beast*," and that, too, in the same breath, using also the same original word for "spirit" in both cases. (Eccl. 3: 21.) Hence,

if "the spirit of man" signifies a spirit-personality, or spirit-man within the material man, then the "spirit of the beast" just as really signifies a *spirit-beast* within the material beast, and there is no possible escape from the revolting conclusion; but if the "spirit of the beast" only signifies the spirit of life, the spirit of man also signifies the same, for the same writer who here speaks of "the *ruach* [spirit] of man," and "the *ruach* [spirit] of the beast," also states in the same discourse, concerning men and beasts—"They all have *one ruach*" (v. 19): not one ghostly *entity*, but one spirit of life.

If we must convert the "spirit of man" into an invisible man, let us be reasonable, and convert the "spirit of the beast" into an invisible beast, and then help the poor Indian chase the spirit-deer through the forests and over the prairies of *Ghostdom*. Don't tell the Indian that there will be no spirit-deer there, unless you also tell him there will be no spirit-Indian there, for there is just as good ground for the one claim as for the other.

VIII. *Spiritualism* is a large and fruitful branch of this popular theological tree. It is needless to spend time in telling how intensely bitter this fruit is. This fact is well understood. It denies God, except as an unorganized principle pervading all nature; it denies Jesus Christ as a divine personage; denies the literal resurrection of the dead; denies a coming judgment; denies the second coming of Christ; denies the existence of a literal devil; denies the inspiration of the Bible; and makes the existence of personal ghosts its chief corner-stone. It claims that ghosts enter into different spheres, and there progress; talks about a summer-land for the shades of the dead, and yet represents them as constantly coming back to the winter-land from which they have gone. But this vile system could never have existed without immortal-soulism as its basis. Don't curse the fruit, and at the same time kiss the parent tree. Lay the ax of truth at the foot of the tree of immortal-soulism, and hew it down, and that act is sure to kill Spiritualism, Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Necromancy, Transmigrationism, Hero-worship, Spirit-deer-hunting, and many similar dogmas. Can a tree yield so much evil fruit, the very existence of which fruit depends upon the existence of this tree, and could never have come into existence without this tree, and still be a good tree? Is it possible for a tree to produce *all* evil fruit, and *no* good fruit, and still be a good tree?

UMI

After seeing how much evil fruit it produces, will some one seek to partially redeem its reputation by saying that it also yields some good fruit? This I deny emphatically. There never has been a particle of good fruit on it, *the existence of which depends upon the existence of the tree.* You may stick apples upon a thorn tree, but the thorn tree never gave them an existence. So you may stick some good fruit on to the tree of immortal-soulism, but it is not a product of the tree. Not one item of Bible theology depends upon immortal-soulism for its existence, while many noted errors are its legitimate offspring. The judgment to come, the resurrection, the celestial kingdom, the giving of immortality to the saints, the giving of crowns of glory to the redeemed ones, and in fact every feature of the plan of salvation from its incipient stage to its mighty completion, are truths that exist independent of immortal-soulism. *Blot out that principle*, and these truths shine as brilliantly as ever; while the cardinal errors of Christendom and Heathendom are thereby plunged into the mighty sea of oblivion, to rise no more.

IX. *Universalism* is another fruit of this great tree. With truthfulness they insist that immortality can no more suffer *pain* than it can suffer death, for pain is the road to death; hence, they deny that the wicked are to be shut out of the kingdom in the world to come. Taking it for granted, without proof, and contrary to evidence, that the souls of the wicked are immortal, and knowing that immortality cannot feel pain, they come to the conclusion that endless pain is not to be experienced by the sinner, and then omit to learn that God has threatened them with the second death; and overlooking this fact, they have blindly come to the conclusion that all men, regardless of character, will finally be saved. They insist that the soul is a part of God, and that consequently it cannot *suffer* nor *die*, as God cannot inflict either suffering or death upon himself; forgetting that this assumption charges all the sin in the world directly upon God, as it is "*the* soul that sinneth" (Ezek. 18: 2); that is, if the soul is a part of God, it is a part of God that sinneth. One of two conclusions must be correct: the soul is either a part of God, or a part of man; if a part of God, it is not only proved immortal, but God is proved to be the author of sin; a conclusion too revolting to be entertained for a moment; but if the soul is a *part of man*, then it is *mortal*, as man bears no higher Bible appellation, in his present state, than "*mortal man*" (Job 4: 17); hence, if the soul is a part of "mortal man," it must be mortal, and capable of experiencing the "second death," agreeing with the statement, "The soul that sinneth, it shall *die*" (Ezek. 18: 2), and "The wages of sin is *death*." (Rom. 6: 23.)

X. *Endless torment* is another fruit of immortal-soulism. Assuming for a fact—what never has been proved, and never can be proved—that the soul is immortal, the claim is set up that there will be no end to the sinner's suffering in hell; that even after unnumbered millions of ages shall have elapsed, death cannot come to his relief. This shocking slander on the character of God is based, mainly, on the unscriptural doctrine of the soul's immortality, while the Scriptures abound with threats of a death penalty against sinners, all of which statements must be made to signify directly the *reverse* of what they say, to harmonize with this dogma.

But we are told that we need endless torment as an inducement to move sinners to repentance. This is a spurious motive. Those who are moved only by the principle of fear cease to move when that principle ceases to propel them. Suppose I say to my child, Do you love father? and receive the reply, No, sir; whereupon I take a whip, and make this threat: Now if you don't love father, I will whip you as long as I live! If I extort love on this principle, how much would it be worth? and how long would it last?

Theology represents God as saying to the sinner, Do you love me? The practical answer is, *No*. Then God is represented as holding the great hell-whip over the sinner, and saying, If you don't love me, I'll whip you as long as I live. Under the spell of fear, the sinner professes love; but how much is it worth? and how long will it last after the whip is out of sight?

Unless there is a principle of love underlying this principle of fear, the service of God is only a slavish task to engage in, and Christian duty is ever irksome to discharge; and no wonder that the world is flooded with backsliders as a result of this principle. It moves men on the very principle that the hard-hearted sailor is moved to tears and prayers in the threatening storm; but let the storm pass, and his piety passes with it. But when "the goodness of God leadeth men to repentance," and when "we love him because he first loved us," we are moved upon by the genuine motive, instead of being influenced by a motive totally selfish and slavish, leading us to act merely for

UMI

the purpose of escaping torment unending. Many are truly converted who are influenced by both of these motives, but the motive of fear exclusively is worthless. It is right to present the "terrors of the Lord," but not the terrors of theology.

It is no help to the cause of Christ to threaten the sinner with a retribution the most fearful and frightful that imagination can grasp, with a design to *scare* him into submission; for when the *fright* is over, the propelling power is extinct, and relaxation is the result. Let men be allured by the lovely character of God, and by his "exceeding great and precious promises," and be made to feel that he is truly their real friend, and is seeking their welfare, and not at the same time planning to eternally inflict unmitigated anguish and endless agony and pain on any of his creatures, and if anything will successfully reach their hearts, this will.

It is true that God threatens the sinner with retribution for sin, on the one hand, while he offers him glory on the other hand; but it is a retribution which, in the first place, appears consistent with the character of a merciful and just God, and in the second place does no look like a mighty effort to scare men, or like an unbounded display of blind rage, unbecoming the character of Deity. The sinner never had any claim upon God for existence. God saw fit to give him a trial existence, with the offer of endless life on condition of faithfulness. In case of unfaithfulness, God does him no injustice in inflicting a punishment upon him for his sins, ultimating in the loss of life, after the judgment, by the infliction of the "*second death.*"

An endless residence of deathless sinners in a literal hell of fire is beginning to look so shocking in the eyes of enlightened people, that there is a revised edition of hell being arranged by theologians, which reduces hell to a mere *guilty conscience.* Well, that is changing from *endless* fire to *no* fire with a mighty stride. I know it looks unreasonable that literal fire should burn immaterial ghosts; and having reduced sinners to mere ghostly shadows, it is quite natural to reduce the fire to *conscience:* but how would some Scriptures sound when quoted with this definition of hell? *e. g.* "Not that thy whole body should be cast into *a guilty conscience:*" or "destroy both soul and body in *a guilty conscience.*" But when these guilty consciences are "*seared*" by an excess of sin, *this* fire burns low. Guilty conscience stings

the man terribly who has committed the first murder, but after he has murdered forty men, conscience becomes easier, being "*seared.*" Besides this, guilty conscience is not the result of judgment, nor after the judgment. The guilty conscience of the horsethief is no part of his punishment. So with the sinner, "who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." Guilt for crime is one thing, and punishment for crime is another thing.

XI. The *spiritual resurrection* theory grows out of immortal-soulism. It sets up the claim that there is a spiritual body within each material body, and that when the material body dies, the spiritual body is resurrected therefrom, leaving the material body to sleep in the dust to all eternity; thus reducing man's future existence to a mere phantom or spectre. But is this theory true? Why may it not be, if the soul is immortal? Why ever reanimate the body, if the soul is a personality independent of the body, and can be better off without the body than with it? But the voice of Inspiration cries, "The *dead* shall be raised" (1 Cor. 15: 52); and, "Thy *dead* men shall *live;* together with my *dead body* shall they arise." (Is. 26: 19.) If there is a spiritual body existing cotemporary with the natural body, the spiritual body being immortal, the resurrection cannot be affirmed of the spiritual body, for it is a "*dead body*" that is to "arise," instead of a *deathless* body. Hence, the resurrection, instead of extracting a live body from a dead one, makes a "DEAD BODY" "*arise,*" and "*live,*" and "sing." Paul, in speaking of the spiritual body, does not even hint that it dwells within the natural body as a distinct personality, to be subtracted therefrom at the hour of death; but instead of teaching that the one exists cotemporary with the other, he plainly establishes the fact that they exist *successively;* that is, that the natural body first has its day, and goes into the grave; then at the resurrection the same body is immortalized, thus becoming a spiritual *body*, but not a bodiless spirit. And Christ, in his resurrected, immortalized state, is presented as a true sample of a spiritual body, being thereby "*made a quickening spirit*" (1 Cor. 15: 45), having "*flesh and bones*" (Luke 24: 39); being in this respect unlike an angelic spirit, which "*hath not* flesh and bones." Once Christ possessed a "natural body" like ours; but at his resurrection, he became a *spirit-body*, or spiritual body; and our spiritual body will come into existence by the same process.

UMI

The Apostle affirms, "That was *not first* which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and AFTERWARD that which is spiritual." We now have a natural body, and, "it is sown a natural body; it is RAISED a *spiritual* BODY" (1 Cor. 15: 44): not a spirit without a body. Here the true order is given: "*first*," the natural body: "*afterward*," the spiritual body. The natural body has its day first, and then enters the grave; but at the resurrection, "it is *raised* a spiritual body:" but the saint has no spiritual body this side of the resurrection. This is Heaven's theology concerning the spiritual body, and is subversive of spiritual-resurrection theology.

XII. The doctrine of the *spiritual coming of Christ*, at the death of his saints, to convey them to a sky-kingdom, is a sprout from the tree of immortal-soulism. Paul tells us that we are to "wait for God's Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead" (1 Thess. 1 : 9, 10), and this proves that the coming of Christ will be *personal*—the coming of a person who had once been "*dead*," instead of some spiritual manifestation, as a substitute for this event; and the same apostle also affirms, "Unto them that look for him shall he appear the *second* time" (Heb. 9 : 28), and this precludes a plurality of future advents of the Savior, and allows us to look for only one, instead of legions, and that one a personal coming. Christ tells us the *object* of his coming: "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself" (John 14 : 3), negating the claim that they are previously received by him. The following facts are here set forth: (1) The very Jesus who was once "*dead*" is to come; (2) it is to be his "*second*" coming; (3) not till then will he "*receive*" the saints unto himself; hence the fallacy of the claim that he comes spiritually, thousands of times every year, to transport saints to another world.

XIII. The unscriptural doctrine of *rewards before the day of judgment* is an offshoot from immortal-soulism. If the soul exists as a distinct personality, after the death of the body, it is quite natural to conclude it must have a dwelling-place in some locality, and that it must there be either happy or unhappy; so theologians have generally concluded to assign heaven to good souls, and hell to bad ones, as soon as death liberates them from the body, regardless of the affirmation that Christ "shall judge the quick and the dead *at his appearing*" (2 Tim. 4 : 1), and in opposition to the Revelator's testimony concerning the scene due

under the sounding of the seventh trumpet: "Thy wrath is come, and the time of the *dead*, that they should be *judged*, and that thou shouldest give REWARD unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great." (Rev. 11 : 18.) That this is the true epoch for the giving of rewards is further evident from the testimony of Christ on different occasions, in the following language: "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and THEN he shall *reward* EVERY man according to his works." (Matt. 16: 27.) Here the time of "*reward*" is specified as plainly as language can be framed together; and we are not only informed here that reward is due when Christ shall "come," but that "EVERY MAN" will then be rewarded; thus proving that "*every man*" will remain unrewarded till that time. About sixty years later, many years subsequent to Christ's ascension, Jesus reiterates this same sentiment, in almost the same phraseology: "Behold, I come quickly; and my *reward* is with me, to give EVERY man according as his work shall be." (Rev. 22 : 12.) Reward is here located at Christ's coming, not for a few merely, but for "*every man*:" and "every man" includes the entire race of Adam.

Were it not for immortal-soulism, the doctrine of reward at death, so contrary to Bible testimony, could never have existed. But when the theory obtains that death liberates a personal ghost from the body, instead of totally killing the man, it becomes a necessity to coin up the doctrine of a reward for ghosts prior to the judgment-day. Some, however, who feel the force of Scripture testimony on this subject, wish to split the difference between truth and error on this point, and plead for a part of the reward at death, admitting that a part is due at the resurrection also. Now if inspired testimony is partly true about the time of reward, may it not be wholly true? Not a word can be found in the entire book of God about two different periods of reward for one person. Besides, it would look unlike God to give a saint a part of his crown at one time, and another part at another; a part of the palm of victory at one time, and another part at another time. It is no part of his work to split crowns, or deal out rewards in installments. No reward is due till the day of settlement arrives, and then it will *all* come. If any part of the reward can be obtained before the judgment-day, why not all of it? and then what need of a judgment at all?

UMI

Has not God located reward subsequent to the judgment, without excepting any part of it? Then why should men decide that God's plan is *partly* wrong, while admitting that it is partly right? Rather "let God be true," not in part only, but fully true, even if immortal-soulism suffers in consequence, as it assuredly will; for the doctrine of reward before the judgment, in part or in full, either for saint or sinner, could never have come into existence independent of immortal-soulism—that great tree of theology which puts forth so many branches of error, loaded with evil fruit. Let the tree be hewn down, and these various branches of error will fall with it.

XIV. The doctrine of a *sky-kingdom* as the future home of the saints is another branch of error belonging to the same tree, originating from the impression that there is an embryo-angel within the saint, and that, when let out of its mortal prison-house, it will soar to the home of the angels on high. But the reader of the Bible is aware that God primarily created our world, and pronounced it not only "*good*," but "VERY GOOD," and that he placed a good man in it, on trial for endless life, with the "tree of life" before him, that at some time in his history, if faithful, he might "eat and live forever." Live *where?* In the very world God created on purpose for him to live in. If sin had never entered, this would have been the home of good men "forever;" and when sin is *removed*, and its results are overwhelmed in oblivion, this same realm will become the home of the good of every age, beyond the judgment-scene; and thus the original purpose of Jehovah in creating this globe will be carried out—earth will be peopled with a race of good men that will "*live forever*," in a Paradise that will bloom under the supervision of Christ, the second Adam, after sin comes to an end, and the results of the fall are repaired. Christ refers to the introduction of this era of sinless and deathless perfection on earth, when glorified humanity will inherit a celestial kingdom, in these words: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit

the *kingdom* prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25 : 31–34.) From this testimony we learn:

1. That the entrance of the saints into the kingdom is not at death, but "*when the Son of man shall come in his glory.*"

2. That the kingdom which they are to inherit is not heaven above, but the very "kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world," after the great separation takes place. Earth is to be renewed, sin to end, death cease, and God's glory to deluge the globe, for God has said, "As truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." But before the dawn of that age of glory, the statement of the apostle Peter must be verified: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto *fire* against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.... The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with a fervent heat.....Neverthless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." (2 Pet. 3 : 7, 10, 13.) Here we have the "*judgment*," the "*fire*," and the "*perdition of ungodly men*" to *precede* the new earth state, "*wherein dwelleth righteousness.*" The "times of restitution" will unfold to our joyful vision the result of the announcement heard by the Revelator while describing the new earth state: "He that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new" (Rev. 21 : 5), not all new things, but "all things new," agreeing with the Psalmist: "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the work of thy hands. *They* shall *perish*, but thou shalt endure: yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou *change* them, and they shall *be changed.*" (Ps. 102 : 25, 26.) Thus the new earth is old earth "*changed*," or *made new;* and then "the tabernacle of God shall be with men,....and there shall be no more death: ....for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21 : 3, 4.) In this thrilling description of future bliss, we have the new Jerusalem coupled with the new earth, as the glorious capital of the world to come. No other home is due the saint of God, and this is not to be enjoyed till after the resurrection and judgment.

But I may be informed that Peter speaks of an inheritance "*reserved in heaven.*" So he does; but that which is "RESERVED IN HEAVEN" cannot be heaven itself, but something distinct

UMI

therefrom; something *deposited* there; and instead of our *emigrating to heaven* to receive it, it is "*ready to be revealed in the last time.*" "Jerusalem which is above" is hereafter to come "down from God out of heaven;" then the saints, as real beings, will enter in through the gates into the city. Christ is coming, angels are coming, and the city is coming, and earth is to be cleansed from sin, and be filled with glory, and Christ is to reign, and the "tabernacle of God is to be with men," and saints are to be "equal to the angels," thus combining a world of glory with a world of *realities.* How much more delightful to contemplate than a world of shadows! Let me be a real being, in a real kingdom, under the supervision of the King of glory, rather than exist as a personal shadow, in a remote realm, peopled with the imaginary shades of the dead. Let me have real society, and be a real being forever.

While immortal-soulism exists, this long train of God-dishonoring errors will prevail. Without immortal-soulism, God could never have been dishonored with Catholicism, Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, Necromancy, Transmigrationism, Hero-worship, Universalism, Endless torment, Spiritual resurrection, Spiritual advent, Rewards at death, and a Sky-kingdom for the saints.

To make war on these mighty errors, or on a part of them, while upholding the *only* platform on which they could possibly stand, is to act unwisely. All these great streams of bitter theology flow from one fountain. Shall we insist that the fountain is *sweet*, and still try to dry up the streams that flow from it? Can both sweet and bitter streams flow from the same fountain? And after seeing so many bitter streams flow out of this fountain, shall we persist in releasing the fountain from the charge of being a bitter fountain, on the mere supposition that it may send out some good streams? Not one good stream has ever been traced to this fountain—no, *not one;* nor can one of these bitter streams be traced to any other fountain. The only way to get rid of these miserable streams is to *dry up the fountain* from which they spring. The stroke that will kill immortal-soulism will also kill every one of these great errors, which have so long dishonored God, and cursed his cause. And so long as this system thrives, these errors will have a support. If you would get rid of a bad effect, ferret out the *cause*, and *remove* it. We have *found* the *cause*, the *true* cause, and the *only* cause of these great

errors. They all originate in immortal-soulism, and could not exist a moment without it. Shall we remove the cause, or shall we help keep alive these God-dishonoring errors by giving our sanction to the *cause* that produces these results? Shall we join hand in hand with the devil in proclaiming, "Ye shall not surely die?" If men really die, the resurrection is *needful;* but if death simply helps an immortal personality to escape from the mortal body, to live on, and live on endlessly, the doctrine of the resurrection is belittled; and as these doctrines cannot be reconciled, the resurrection is being rapidly discarded, by substituting in its stead a spiritual resurrection, which is only a blind method of denying the doctrine; but the blow that is dealt against a future *literal* resurrection of the saints will fall with equal force against the doctrine of Christ's resurrection in the past; and when that is blotted out, our hope is obliterated forever; "for if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain." (1 Cor. 15 : 16, 17.) The whole Christian system falls to the ground the moment we blot out Christ's resurrection, and that resurrection is blotted out by the same stroke that blots out our future literal resurrection, for his resurrection and ours are the same in kind, his being the first-fruits: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the *first-fruits* of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the *resurrection of the dead.*" (1 Cor. 15 : 20, 21.) As Christ is the resurrected *first-fruits*, and as he affirmed after his resurrection, "I am he that liveth, and *was dead*" (Rev. 1 : 18), thus proving his resurrection a literality, it follows that our resurrection must be like his; agreeing with Paul, "We look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall *change our vile body*, that it may be *fashioned* like unto his glorious BODY." (Phil. 3 : 20, 21.)

We have clearly discovered, in this brief examination of the subject, that there is a correct and an incorect theory of immortality. The correct theory is based upon Christ and the resurrection, attainable on conditions of obedience and faithfulness; while the incorrect theory is founded on immaterialism, independent of Christ, and regardless of character. Is not "the gift of God eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ?" (Rom. 6 : 23.) And has not every man eternal life who is immortal? In other words, can that which is immortal ever die? And if not, must it not live eternally? And can it be anything less

UMI

than eternal life to live eternally? And if we already possess a nature that will require us to live eternally, whether we receive Christ or not, how can eternal life be the "*gift* of God" through Christ? And is not the commencement of eternal life at the *resurrection*, as the angel affirmed: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall *awake*, some to *everlasting life?*" (Dan. 12 : 2.) But I may be met with the claim that we are said to have eternal life in the *present tense*. So we are, in the same sense that the check-holder may be said to have a million of dollars, while every cent of it is in the bank for a stipulated time, to be given to him at the proper time, if the conditions are not forfeited. "And this is the record, that God *hath* given to us *eternal life*, and *this life* is in his Son." (1 John 5 : 11.) We have it now *prospectively*, but it is deposited "*in his Son*;" for Christ "*is our life*," "the resurrection and the *life*," in the sense of being the *Life-giver*. "And this is the *promise* that he hath *promised us*, even ETERNAL LIFE." (John 2 : 25.) And Christ adds: "In the *world to come* eternal life." (Mark 10 : 30.) Let immortality be given to the saint at the resurrection, and let *eternal life* then commence as the result, and then we can recognize it as the gift of God, through Christ, to the faithful only.

The Christian Church is even yet but very imperfectly freed from the unholy influence, and the mischievous operation of human authority. The house requires to be more carefully swept than it was at the reformation from Popery, and a more thorough search must be made for the old leaven, that it may be more completely cast out. Let all individual Christians, let all Christian Churches learn to act on *principle*, that in reference to Christian faith and duty, and worship, the question is not, How *thinkest* thou? but, "How *readest* thou?" Not, What is the use and wont? but, What is written in the Law? Not, How is it to be arranged by us? but, How has it been settled by our Master? Let us "seek out of the book of the Lord and read."—*Dr. Brown.*

It is generally conceded that by the expression, 'God breathed into him the breath of life, and man became a living soul,' no more is meant than that God caused him to breathe, and he became a living soul. "Living soul" is applied to him in common with birds, beasts, and reptiles in the same chapter.—*C. Beecher.*

THE THRONE OF DAVID.

By ELD. FRANK BURR, New Rutland, Ill.

"Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." (Heb. 1 : 8.)

When sin entered this fair world, bringing its blight of desolation and ruin to the guilty pair and their offspring, in love and mercy to fallen man the Almighty enters, of his own free will, into covenant on his part for a restitution—a redemption, and proposes in that redemption and restitution to bring about and cause to exist such a state of affairs as shall please him, and be in harmony with his character. He covenants to produce a Redeemer who shall bruise the serpent's head. In hope and anticipation of this, Abel offers his lamb, and God's people present their bloody sacrifices on the altar of faith.

Again, he meets Abraham, and enters into covenant, promising unto the faithful ones a restituted earth, a heavenly country, a new heavens and earth, as their everlasting home.

Finally, he sends his prophet to Israel's king, to David, and makes known to him the perpetuity of his house and throne in that glorious heavenly land, where the death blight is gone forever, and immortality alone is found.

The subject of the restitution of David's throne and kingdom is vastly interesting to the human race, inasmuch as it is an embodiment of one of the three great promises of the gospel of God. It is intimately connected with the promise of eternal life; so much so that the apostle Paul offers it as a conclusive argument of the immortal resurrection of Christ, saying—"And as concerning that he raised him up from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David." (Acts 13 : 34.) This seems to be a strange argument to prove the incorruptibility of Christ in his resurrection; nevertheless it is doubtless one of the strongest that could be offered. Let us investigate the record and note the connection. Turning to the 89th Psalm we read—"I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever;....for I have said Mercy shall be built up forever;....I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations."

UMI

Here everlasting mercy is coupled with the perpetuity of the seed of David and his throne. The covenant and oath here referred to may be found recorded in 2 Sam. 7: 12, 13. Farther on in the Psalm we find the covenant repeated in strong language. "My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven....My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me." (vv. 28, 29, 34, 36.)

We see by these quotations the intimate connection of the "sure mercies of David" with eternal life: for as the seed and throne of David are to be perpetuated forever, he who has the sure or everlasting mercy here promised must of necessity be immortal. But Christ is the one here meant by the "seed;" and so Paul wrote to Timothy: "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel." (2 Tim. 2: 8.) Also in writing his epistle to the Romans he says the gospel of God is "concerning Jesus Christ our Lord which was made of the seed of David." (Rom. 1: 3.) So also his lineage and genealogy are traced back by both Matthew and Luke to David.

But lest the perpetuity of the throne of David may be yet considered limited in time, the previous quotations being based on the term 'forever' for duration, which term is more frequently limited than otherwise, let us quote one or two passages which cannot be ambiguous. In Isaiah's prophecy we read: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder;....of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." (ch. 9: 6, 7.) Also we have the words of the angel to Mary saying: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David;....and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1: 32, 33.) Here we see the perpetuity of the throne is eternal, it having "*no end.*" Therefore the "seed" who shall occupy it must be made immortal, and thus be also without end of life.

DAVID'S THRONE IN HISTORY.

David succeeded Saul on the throne of Israel, being the chosen of God to establish Israel in peace. After the covenant is made with him concerning the eternal condition of his seed and throne, David "fell on sleep and saw corruption." "For David is not ascended into the heavens." (Acts 2: 34.) The city of David, the stronghold of Zion, had been taken from the Jebusites, and there David's throne was established: but the king whose strong arm had conquered all his foes and brought peace to Israel must now himself fall a victim to death. His voice which had so often tuned its notes to Israel's sweetest psalms is hushed in death. He has not gone up on high, but "is both dead and buried." (Acts 2: 29.) And thus he sleeps, waiting the sounding of the trump which shall awake the dead.

Solomon takes his place as ruler of Israel, and the kingdom passes on. Solomon passes away in death and his sons succeed him, but they are sinful rulers. Iniquity ripens fast until at last the crisis comes. Zedekiah sits upon the throne ruling perversely, when Ezekiel, sent by the Lord, thunders forth this prophetic word in his ears: "And thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come when iniquity shall have an end, thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown:....I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more until he come whose right it is: and I will give it him." (Ezek. 21: 25–27.)

Mark! he does not say it shall be overturned *forever;* but "*until*" a certain event; and that event is the coming of "him whose right it is," and that is only Christ; for he never forfeited it by disobedience as did Solomon and his successors. Christ has fulfilled all the conditions of the covenant as given in the 89th Psalm, and he is the only one of all David's seed of whom this can be said.

The words of the prophet were fulfilled. The diadem was removed, the crown was taken off, and Zedekiah taken captive by the king of Babylon, left the throne to be continually vacant or "no more" until the King of kings shall come and claim it as his own.

The prophet Micah, seeing the iniquity of the priests and judges in Jerusalem, speaks of the condition of the city during its desolation on this wise: "Therefore shall Zion for your sake

UMI

be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest." (Mic. 3: 12.) Three facts are mentioned here, viz: the plowing of Mt. Zion as a field—the desolation of Jerusalem as a city—and Mt. Moriah where the temple stood, should be a place of idolatrous worship. Surely the occurence of these events would not aid in the restitution of David's throne, but rather add to its desolation. While these things exist, certainly the throne of empire can never find its seat in Zion. But the Psalmist says: "The Lord hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest forever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it. There will I make the horn of David to bud." (Ps. 132: 13, 14, 17.) Therefore it is quite evident that a change must come, from desolation and ruin to grandeur and glory. Has it come? We may go to-day and stand on that sacred spot within the walls of the "city of the Great King," and we still behold its ruin. Zion is still a field for the plowman's toil, while he annually rears his barley and rye. The city still presents its ruins of ancient walls and palaces to show its glory has departed, while on Moriah's mount, where stood the temple with its shechinal glory and the altar fires of God's ancient people, stands the Mosque of Omar with its domes and minarets glistening in the sun, an idolatrous shrine for the worship of the False Prophet.

Why should this be so now? How long must Jerusalem be thus desolate? When will its glory return and its desolation be ended? Hear the words of the Great Teacher: 'Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." (Luke 21: 24.) Here is the word "until" again, marking a limit for the treading down, but that limit is only the closing of Gentile times or dominion, and closes with the same scenes that terminate the "until" in Ezekiel's prophecy, viz: the coming of him whose right it is to rule and reign. In harmony with this the early Christians promulgated the doctrine of Jerusalem's desolation until the end of Gentile rule. Julian, the apostate emperor of Rome, conceived the idea of restoring the Mosaic form of worship in Jerusalem, and thus proving Jesus a false prophet and impostor. Accordingly, in the year 363 he issued a call to all the Jews in his empire to assemble in their holy city and restore its former grandeur. The work commenced gloriously, but was suddenly relinquished, as historians relate, because of "horrible balls of fire, breaking out near the foundations, with frequent and reiterated attacks, which rendered the place from time to time inaccessible to the scorched and blasted workmen." (*Student's Gibbon*, p. 171.) Thus God's sacred word has been fulfilled, in spite of the efforts of kings and emperors to overthrow it, and bring it to naught.

On six different occasions has an apostate church sought to wrest the holy city from the Saracenic rule, and make it no more a desolation: but each crusade has been a signal failure, and the reason of Jerusalem's desolation to-day is simply because the "until" that alone can be the limit of the "treading down" has not yet transpired, and will not while Jesus remains above; "whom the heaven must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts 3: 21.)

DAVID'S THRONE RESTORED.

Thus far we have seen that for more than two thousand years the throne of David has been overturned, and yet God, who will not lie, has sworn that it shall be restored, and perpetuated eternally. We find the royal "seed," Christ, has been raised from the dead to immortality, but he does not yet occupy the throne of David. Instead of this we see him far away from earth, sitting on the right hand of God, according to the invitation given —"Sit thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool." (Acts 2: 34.) Here another "until" marks a limitation of the time of his occupying the Almighty's throne. Therefore he cannot be occupying the throne of David *now*, as some teach, for he is to leave the throne he *now* occupies: but his occupancy of David's throne is to have "no end."

He says, himself, also: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." (Rev. 3: 21.) We see by this that he is not yet occupying his own throne, which is the throne of David. He refers to the *time* of his taking his own throne in one of his discourses, saying: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of *his* glory." (Matt. 25: 31.) Then all the periods limited by the word "until," the *overturning*, the *treading down*, the *sitting above*, shall expire, and he shall come to claim his throne.

UMI

Three things are to be noticed in this connection, viz: the *people*, the *throne*, and the *territory*. The people are the "house of Jacob." Jacob was a "supplanter" (Gen. 27: 36), and his name is used for Christ in Ps. 24: 6, and elsewhere. Jacob supplanted Esau, whose name, as Edom, signifies earthy; and in allegory, Esau is the temporal kingdom of mortal Israel, to be supplanted by Christ, the Jacob who inherits the blessing, and becomes the father of the house of Jacob, "whose house are we." (Heb. 3: 6.) Christ does not propose to reign over the house of Esau, or mortal Israel, but "as a son over his own house, whose house are we." (Heb. 3: 6.)

"All Israel shall be saved;" but "they are not all Israel who are of Israel," but "in Isaac shall thy seed be called:" and in another place it is written: "Now *we*, *brethren*, as Isaac was, are the children of promise." (Gal. 4: 28.) When the King comes he will speak and the dead shall hear his voice, and "his people shall be willing in the day of his power," and those sleeping in the dust of the earth shall awake and put on their beautiful garments of immortality, and ascend to meet their glorious King. All God's people changed to immortality will be glorified Israel, subject to Christ in his kingdom.

Then comes the glory of Zion and Jerusalem so long desolate and trodden down in the dust. "When the Lord shall build up Zion he shall appear in his glory." (Ps. 102: 16.) Then "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads." (Is. 35: 10.) Again: "Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed." (Is. 33: 20.) Thus will the Lord remember Zion as he has said, for the New Jerusalem shall come down in all its glory, and the "city of the Great King," "the tabernacle of God," shall be established forever, and the Throne of David shall no more be fallen; for, says the prophet, "in that day I will raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof." (Amos 9: 11.) The apostle James declares this prophecy to be for the purpose of saving "all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." (Acts 15: 17.) How beautifully does Isaiah speak of the coming glory to Zion in the fortieth, sixtieth, sixty-first, and sixty-second chapters of his prophecy.

Then shall the earth be renewed, purged from sin and pollution by the fires of judgment, and shall come forth a new earth, glorified and eternal, with Jesus sitting on the throne of David—

"There all ages to abide,"

while the eternally redeemed shall praise Zion's king forever and ever.

A groaning earth awaits the coming of her King. A groaning church await with longing hearts the glorious blissful day when her Deliverer shall appear—

"And place her enthroned at his side,
In glory that never shall end."

But "the Lord shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath." (Ps. 110: 5.) The Gentile nations shall be swept away like the chaff of the summer threshing-floor, forever gone, but the eternal kingdom shall never pass away. Let the glory come, let Zion be redeemed! is the cry of the saints: for unless the throne of David be restored, God's people have no hope that can ever be realized. Take away the restitution of David's throne in the future, and you take away the future glory, and kingdom, and salvation of God's people. But the word is pledged. God has sworn to accomplish it. "The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." (Is. 9: 7.) Yes, the glory *shall come*. Gethsemane's groans and darkness shall pass away. Calvary shall no longer be a "place of skulls." Zion shall shine with the glorious light of the New Jerusalem, the city of our God.

"Hallelujah again,
Hallelujah amen!
Shout! for the work of redemption is done."

"COME QUICKLY!" This is the Church's hearty echo to Christ's promise, "Behold I come quickly." Come, Lord Jesus! Thus beats the pulse of the Church, thus the mystical body of Christ; and we should never be satisfied till we find such a spirit breathing in us, and causing us to look for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the great God, and our Savior Jesus Christ. What comes from heaven in a promise, should be sent back to heaven in a prayer. Come, Lord Jesus, put an end to this state of sin, and sorrow, and temptation, and gather thy people out of this present evil world."—*Matthew Henry.*

UMI

A REVIEW OF PROF. BARTLETT'S

"REFUTATION OF THE THEORY OF ANNIHILATION."[1]

By HENRY CONSTABLE, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland.

This is a very learned, a very labored, a very able, and, we must add, a most futile effort to sustain a theory that is rapidly losing its hold upon the minds of thoughtful and truth-loving men both in America and Great Britain. We are very glad to have had our attention drawn to this work of Prof. Bartlett. We have for some years been engaged upon the great subject which it discusses. We have carefully read the controversy as it has been conducted in England, and ourselves aided, so far as lay in our power, toward its settlement. We have seen all that has been urged in England in defence of the Augustinian theory of the eternity of evil, and have readily turned to see what its advocates in America have been able to advance in its defence. For this purpose we have read with very great care Prof. Bartlett's work, which has been represented to us as the ablest that has appeared in the United States. We can readily believe it to be such. We can at all events only say that in our opinion it is very far superior to anything we have seen on the same side in the Old Country. We feel, after reading him, that the Professor of Chicago has said all that can be said, and said it well, for his side of the question. We also feel, after reading him, that his learning, his ingenuity, his great reasoning powers have not advanced a single argument that can stand calm and close examination. From our little island of Ireland, whose rugged shores are beaten by the wave of the ocean which stretches unbroken to his own great continent, we send to him, in no spirit of ill-will, our honest review of his work.

Before entering upon the regular argument of Prof. Bartlett we would make a few preliminary remarks which we consider to be called for, and which, we think, will help to the better understanding of this subject. We will first draw attention to the *title* which he and his fellow reasoners in general *insist* on attaching to the theory which affirms the eternal death and destruction of the ungodly in the future world. The only title he will allow it is that of "annihilation," and the use of this term he expressly tells us is "*indispensable*" *for his purposes.* (Pref., p. 5.) He will not, and he cannot, conduct the controversy without attaching this term to the theory of his opponents, whether they object to it or not. If he were to allow them without a protest to call their theory a theory of "destruction," he feels that he would be abandoning a vantage ground on which alone he can hope to fight the battle with success.

[1] *Life and Death Eternal: A Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation.* By Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D., Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Boston: American Tract Society. 1866.

Now why does Prof. Bartlett insist that the use of the term "annihilation" is "*indispensable*" for his argument? "Destruction" and "annihilation" are words very commonly used by the best English writers as words of the same meaning, and so the Professor himself acknowledges. (p. 368.) If any one doubts this, he need only consult Webster's Dictionary, which makes the two terms synonymous and interchangeable. Why then must the Professor deny that our theory is rightly called a theory of destruction, and insist that it must and ought to be called one of annihilation; *when annihilation and destruction mean the same thing?*

We can only imagine two reasons for the Professor's anxiety on this point. The first is this: The *word* "annihilation" does not occur in our English translation of the Bible. In another form it frequently does, as when Isaiah says of the enemies of Israel: "They that war against thee shall be *as nothing, and as a thing of naught*" (ch. 41: 12); for "annihilation" simply means bringing to nothing. *What it signifies* is affirmed of the ungodly in a thousand places of Scripture, wherever their *destruction* is spoken of. But the word itself is not in our translation. We can therefore readily suppose that the opponents of our theory prefer the use of a term which is not in the English version, and which may lead thoughtless minds to suppose that the theory is itself unscriptural. Does any consideration of this kind unconsciously influence Prof. Bartlett? We ask him of what little real service to his cause it can be to attach to our theory a term not found in the English version, when the thing intended by that term is conveyed by other terms over and over again?

If this is not the Professor's real reason, we can only imagine one other. Besides its sense of "disorganization," or "destruc-

UMI

tion," annihilation is very often used to express a process which modern philosophy, we believe, universally denies. It is the process of reducing matter to nothing, not simply of destroying the organization of a body, but of *reducing the parts themselves of which the body was composed to nothing.* Of this Bacon, and with him all philosophy, says: "*It is impossible* for any body to be utterly annihilated." Now we remark of Prof. Bartlett, that it is *in this sense* he constantly uses the term throughout his work. "*No matter,*" he tells us in one place, "*is annihilated:*" and in another place he quotes Abp. Whately as expressing his own views when he says—"It is equally impossible to annihilate the smallest as the largest quantity of matter." (pp. 38, 135.) He also repeatedly finds fault with his opponents for using "destruction" as an equivalent for "annihilation." (pp. 341, 369.) Now the effect produced on unthinking or ignorant persons by all this manipulation is *that there is no such thing possible as annihilation means.* To minds thus tutored and prepared our theory is proposed *as one of annihilation.* We are told that we may not, and ought not to call it a theory of destruction, but that annihilation is its only proper designation.

What is the conclusion which will be drawn from this artful handling of the subject? We do not say that Prof. Bartlett intends such a conclusion to be drawn, but we do say that such is the conclusion to which his mode of reasoning naturally leads. It is this, that we who hold that the ungodly will finally lose their being and existence are *teaching a doctrine of annihilation which philosophy denies to be possible.* Is it fair to enlist such a prejudice against us? Is it fair to create by this use of terms an impression of our views which is not a true one? For we do not hold the philosophical annihilation of matter any more than Prof. Bartlett. We do not know of a single thinker on our side who does. We challenge Prof. Bartlett to produce even one of us who does. We hold the final disorganization and destruction of the ungodly which even Prof. Bartlett is obliged (p. 368) to allow is the "popular" sense of "annihilation." Why then draw special attention to the word in its philosophic sense, concentrate the view on this as the proper sense, and then attach the term to our view as though this was its sense when it is not! Is it "*indispensable*" to give an untrue coloring to our theory in order to hold it up to public reprobation? Is it thus only it can be prevented from taking its place in the faith of Christians?

But if Prof. Bartlett says that he does not mean to represent us as holding a philosophical error, but that he only uses the term "annihilation" as applied to our view in its popular sense, then he must allow that our theory has just as good a right to be called a theory of "destruction" as one of "annihilation;" for, taken in the popular sense, "annihilation" and "destruction" are one and the same thing.

And now let us clear away the ground before we proceed to examine Prof. Bartlett's arguments. Let us see what is the *real question* between him and us. He has produced by his way of proceeding a great deal of obscurity which must be removed.

And in the first place he would lead his readers to suppose that *he was the upholder and we the deniers of a future life!* He ranks us with the Epicureans of Greece, the Sadducees of Judea, and the Revolutionists of France. (Pref., p. 6.) Is Prof. Bartlett serious in making such a charge? Does he know the opinions of those Epicureans and Sadducees which he confounds with ours? Is he not aware that they taught that there was *no future life* for mankind at all, and that the death which all here incur is, for *all alike* an eternal sleep? This is not our opinion, nor is it, so far as we know, the opinion of any writer on our side. We *all* hold a future and that an eternal life for the redeemed. For our part we hold a future life for the reprobate likewise, though, following our Lord's teaching, we do not hold it to be eternal. And yet Prof. Bartlett holds us up as holding the doctrine of the Sadducee and the Epicurean in their denial of a future life! Please to withdraw your assertion, Prof. Bartlett, for we abhor the leaven of the Sadducee as much as you do yourself.

Prof. Bartlett probably falls into this serious misrepresentation of us from confounding, as many writers on his side do, belief in a future life with belief in the inalienable immortality of man. The two are quite distinct. We will show this from one of those instances which he heaps up at random as though every believer in a future life was necessarily a believer in his theory of immortality. He brings forward the Buddhists in support of his view. (Pref., p. 6.) Now it is certainly the fact that the Buddhists do believe in a future life for all spirits after bodily death; but it is also a fact that they do *not* believe in the immortality of any spirit whatsoever; for they hold that after passing through many transmigrations they at last sink into nothingness and lose all

UMI

personality. This is a common opinion with the Dyaks of Borneo also.[1] Prof. Bartlett had much better quote us, poor annihilationists, in support of his theory; for while we hold a future life for all, whether saved or lost, we hold that this future life will be an eternal one for the redeemed.

What then is the real difference between the Professor's theory and ours? It is this, and this only! *He holds the eternity of evil and misery, and we do not!* It is for *this* that he is contending. All that is good, happy, glorious, in the view of immortality, we hold and believe as our heritage in Jesus Christ. But all this he thinks nothing unless he can show side by side with this glorious future of the immortality of the redeemed an equal immortality of the lost. It is not for a future life he argues, it is not for a blessed immortality he reasons; it is wholly and solely for an eternity of evil, of blasphemy, of anguish, the very contemplation of which "confounds" and "appalls" his own mind when he summons up courage to gaze upon its "terrific" aspect! (p. 16.) Let our readers remember that *this* is the prize for which the Professor contends. It is not a future life—it is not a blessed immortality—*it is only an immortality of evil and wo.* We will not be misrepresented by him as denying the former: it gives us unutterable joy to be able, in obedience to God's Word, to reject the latter as the foulest slander upon God's character that Satan has ever succeeded in imposing upon the faith of man.

It is for the old Manichæan heresy of the eternity of evil, introduced in a new shape, that Prof. Bartlett and his fellow-laborers contend! And how is this "terrific" theory sought to be maintained by him?

One might fairly expect that he would boldly maintain *the justice* of his view—that he would tell us that a life of everlasting torment is the just award which not only sins of knowledge but also sins of ignorance committed by the creature in this short life deserve. In older times a defence of this as just used to be made. But Prof. Bartlett avoids this ground. He will not here contend. He knows that the infidel proclaims aloud that such a punishment is rank injustice: he knows that men who believe God's words as truly as he does proclaim the same: he knows that those who hold his view mourn and groan in spirit at its "terrific" appearance: but not one word will the Professor

[1] *Life in the Far East*, by S. St. John, vol. I., pp. 181-2.

utter to silence the taunts of opponents, to calm the uneasiness of friends. He knows that a punishment such as he asserts *appears* unjust in the eyes and the judgment of mankind. And what is his escape? He tells us we cannot now judge at all in this matter; *i. e.*, that throughout the whole of human existence, God's conduct *must appear unjust* in the eyes of his creatures. He does more than this: he tells us that at no future period shall either we or any creature however exalted be able to form any opinion on the subject, for that it "would *require a knowledge of God's whole being, resources, views, intentions,*" to be able to do so. (p. 19.) So that according to the Professor, *God's conduct will probably appear unjust in the eyes of all his creation throughout eternity;* for certainly a knowledge such as he speaks of above can be possessed by no creature whatsoever!

Such is the Professor's refuge! Do not, he tells us, dare to scan God's conduct—turn away your eyes from such unhallowed gaze—if you examine into what he does it must appear to you unjust—close your ears to those endless wailings—your eyes to those eternal agonies—your reason to why they are deserved and are essential—think of all this as a mere "*question of fact.*" (p. 19.) Ah, no, Prof. Bartlett, we cannot think of this question as a mere question of fact; as such a question as the hight of a mountain in the moon, as the distance of the sun from the earth. The character of our God is too dear to us for that. The eternal of our brothers and sisters is too solemn for treatment such as this. We must and will look *at the justice of the case. You make no defence, and therefore we conclude that no defence can be made.*

God does not appeal to us to judge his conduct (Ezek. 18: 29), and act in such a manner as must appear unjust in the eyes of every rational being who is invited to judge. The theory of eternal torments is dismissed on the merits of the case. The question is a great *moral* question, and moral considerations cannot be excluded.

And now let us calmly inquire into the grounds of a theory for which Mr. Bartlett cannot say one word on the score of justice—a theory which confounds and dismays its upholders, gives to the infidel his keenest weapon of offence, and violates every idea of justice conceivable by the human mind. It requires evidence of the very highest kind to establish an ordinary miracle, which is but a departure from the ordinary known laws of nature: most assuredly it will require evidence of a similar kind to es-

UMI

tablish a theory such as this; which, to our minds, departs from every law of right and justice as established by God and agreed on by man.

Now when we come to inquire into the evidence advanced by Mr. Bartlett for his theory we will find it of the very poorest and most unsatisfactory kind. He ascertains (ch. 2) that language, including very many of, possibly all, the terms used in Scripture descriptive of future punishment, has *a primary* and *a secondary* meaning. For example, he tells us that while the primary sense of *death* is, as Webster defines it, "the cessation of all the vital functions, the extinction of bodily life," it has also a secondary meaning; and implies the *misery and moral disorganization* of a being who may be possessed of bodily life in full vigor. (pp. 38–41.) From this step he advances to another. The secondary or derived sense of language, as relates to the terms of future punishment and many other terms, he tells us has become, not only the "higher" and more "frequent" sense, but *also the sense in which such terms are most commonly used.* (p. 21.) Thus he teaches that while we may sometimes mean by "death" "the cessation of existence," this is by no means *its usual sense* either in common life or in those Holy Scriptures which he very correctly tells us "everwhere speak in the language of the people." (p. 23.) The ordinary meaning of "death" in common speech is, according to the Professor, misery and moral disorder. (p. 21.)

From this step Mr. Bartlett advances to a third. Having, as he supposes, established the secondary sense of the terms in question as their common and usual sense, he very naturally tells us that it is in this sense we ought to accept these terms when applied to the punishment of the wicked in the future life. Hence, according to him, whenever we are told in Scripture that after the judgment the wicked will "die" or suffer "death," we are not to take this expression in its primary sense as indicating the cessation of their existence, but are to take it in its secondary sense as indicating "*misery*," *or the deprivation of their "true functional action.*" (p. 41.) This latter, being, as he tells us, the usual sense of death in common life, and Scripture, and with "the best lexicographers," ought to be taken as its meaning when applied in Scripture to future punishment! Such is a brief and fair outline of Prof. Bartlett's argument in the first part of his work.

But he is not quite satisfied with it. Knowing well that, while the terms in question are admitted to have a secondary sense such as he puts upon them, it is wholly denied that such secondary sense is their common sense, or is admissible for one moment in their application to future punishment, he brings forward in the second part of his work a reason which is to compel us to take these terms in their secondary sense, no matter whether that be their common sense or not.

In common life we sometimes hear of a person, whom we see or otherwise *know to be possessed of bodily life*, exclaiming when overwhelmed with calamity that he has "perished," has been "destroyed," or is even "dead" while alive. Mr. Bartlett has given many instances of this; and they could be multiplied at pleasure a hundred or a thousand-fold. In cases of this kind we know, from our knowledge that the person is possessed of bodily life when he has uttered these wild exclamations, that the terms *cannot be taken in their primary meaning, but must be taken in their secondary sense.* Or, in Scripture, *persons, known to be possessed of bodily life and intellectual qualities in full exercise*, are spoken of as being, *at that very time, or at some previous period of their existence, dead, or dead in sins.* Here too we know, from our knowledge that the persons in question are possessed of physical life, and as such only are addressed at all, that the term "death" cannot be taken in its primary sense as indicating "the cessation of existence," but *must be taken in some secondary sense as indicating a great moral disorganization and loss of spiritual life.* In the same way Prof. Bartlett endeavors to show that the terms of future punishment cannot be taken in their primary, but must be taken in their secondary sense. His attempted proof is Plato's old theory—by Plato himself never accepted as really satisfactory—*of the inalienable immortality of all men whether good or bad.*

The wicked are immortal, according to Prof. Bartlett. As gifted with immortality, they never can, according to him, suffer a "cessation of existence." Hence all the terms descriptive of their future punishment *must needs* be taken in some secondary sense. It is no matter whether that be their common sense or not, it must *here* be their sense. As when Jeremiah in the dungeon (Lam. 3: 43, 53) exclaimed that men had "cut off his life," and that God had "slain" him (p. 30), we know that these strong expressions cannot mean the "cessation of Jeremiah's existence," *because we know that he was alive;* so when Scripture speaks of the

wicked hereafter suffering death as a punishment, we are also to know that this cannot mean the "cessation of their existence," *because the wicked are immortal and therefore cannot cease to exist.* Such is Prof. Bartlett's famous "supplement" in his second book to his argument in the first. If the wicked were indeed immortal, it would form a powerful argument. If they are not immortal the argument is worth nothing. Plato may argue for their immortality, but God's word denies it; and therefore, Prof. Bartlett's learned researches into Egyptian mysteries, and Greek speculations, and Rabbinical traditions, are not worth the trouble he has taken. The Professor is only seeking to *establish a false law of lingual interpretation by a philosophical myth.*

We will now examine Prof. Bartlett's argument with somewhat more of detail, and show our readers its essential weakness. We will not dispute with him that the terms of future punishment have a primary and a secondary meaning, *or even that their secondary meaning is such as he gives.* We are here only addressing the English scholar, and arguing on the sense of the words of our English version. Were we arguing with a Greek scholar, acquainted with the original language of our Gospels and Epistles, we could take much higher ground. The Greek phrases for future punishment are much more numerous than our English version would lead us to suppose; and, while the Greek phrases have no doubt their primary and secondary meanings, often corresponding exactly with those of the English terms, *some* of the Greek terms have *no sense, primary or secondary*, that will admit of Mr. Bartlett's theory of future punishment. As the Professor is a Greek scholar, we are ready to meet *him* on this classical ground. But now only taking into account the terms of our English version, we will show our readers the utter futility of Mr. Bartlett's labored argument.

There are a great many terms in Scripture expressive of future punishment. It is described as "death," "destruction," "perdition," "loss of life," and so on. Of course we cannot enter upon an examination of all these phrases, else we should be writing a volume as lengthened as that on which we are now writing an article in a review. To bring our remarks within the necessary compass, and at the same time to give them the required fullness and clearness, we must confine our examination to *one* of the above terms, and we will take the important term of *death*.

Death, according to repeated passages of Scripture, is to be

the punishment of the wicked hereafter. Here there is no dispute. Our object is to ascertain its sense in Scripture *when it is thus applied.* Death has a primary and a secondary meaning. Here too there is no dispute. There shall be no dispute either as to what are its primary and secondary meanings, for we will take Prof. Bartlett's definitions *of* them. Accepting those definitions as sufficiently correct, we will join issue with him as to which is to be taken when future punishment is described.

The primary sense of death, then, according to Prof. Bartlett, is "*loss of* existence" or "physical death." (pp. 21, 47.) To this definition of his we will take the liberty to add the fuller, but perfectly harmonious definition of Webster, the great American authority on the sense of the English language. Death, then, according to Webster, is, in its primary sense, "that state of a being, animal or vegetable, but more particularly of an animal, in which there is *total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions*" Here we have the primary sense of the word "death" in the English, and, we may add, every language of the world. In this sense we maintain that the word is used when it is applied in Scripture to future punishment, and Mr. Bartlett allows that if it is thus used in Scripture, our view is right and his is wrong.

But death has a secondary sense also. We freely allow it, and have no objection to its having several secondary senses. We will now however confine ourselves to the secondary sense in which Mr. Bartlett uses it, and in which sense he maintains that it is to be taken when applied in Scripture to future punishment. Death then in this secondary sense is with Prof. Bartlett "the effect of sin," the absence or loss of "welfare, prosperity, happiness," "is that state of separation from God, and from the beatific vision of God, in which all the higher faculties of human nature are working falsely and discordantly; in which the true end of living is discarded, and its true enjoyment lost; and in which there is at last the complete extinction, not of the soul's being, but of its *well*-being." (pp. 38, 41, 46.) Death is "a moral or spiritual state of the soul," it designates "a moral wreck." (pp. 49, 50, 69.)

Now we have not the smallest objection to allowing that "death" is frequently taken in Scripture in this secondary sense. Mr. Bartlett need not have taken so much pains to prove it, for we really do not know of any one who denies it. He speaks of

the state of the unregenerate man before he is quickened by the Spirit of God, and which Paul describes in a few words—"dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. 2: 1.) In such men there is, while they are possessed of physical life, spiritual death, or "the total cessation" of spiritual life; *i. e.*, of faith in and love for God. We do not object in the least to the Professor's definition of "death:" we only object to its application. *This death*, he tells us, is the second death, is God's punishment hereafter for sin, is what shall be inflicted in the future retribution upon sinners in its "matured and perfected" stage. (p. 46.) Hell, with him, is but the continuation and carrying out and completing of the process here begun, the making the "moral wreck" a more completely moral wreck than it is now. It is making the "higher faculties of human nature" to work yet more "falsely and discordantly" than they have ever worked: to cause the "true end of life" to be "discarded" more utterly than it has ever been discarded by the vilest of sinners, and so to cause the "true enjoyment" of life to be more utterly "lost," and the "soul's well-being" to be more miserably cast away than it has ever here been done. Hell, in a word, is God's institution for intensifying and increasing throughout eternity the moral evil and misery which sin has introduced.

We would almost think that the mere description in plain language of Prof. Bartlett's horrible theory would be sufficient to refute it. However, we will present our readers with his reasons for accepting it, and our reasons for rejecting it as resting on the abuse of human language, as contradicting the plainest testimony of Scripture, and as throwing a slander upon the character of God of as deep and foul a nature as it is possible to conceive. Of all such *intention* we fully acquit Prof. Bartlett, but that his theory has such an effect we will show.

We would first draw our reader's attention to the great *similarity of argument* used for the Augustinian theory of endless life in misery and for Origen's theory of universal restoration. One main basis of the theory of each is the *inalienable immortality of all men.* The other main basis of each is *the use of the terms of Scripture descriptive of future punishment in a secondary sense.* Thus the second death in hell is with the former *a death in sin* producing evil and misery, while it is with the latter *a death to sin* producing holiness and happiness. Both theories discard the primary sense of the term "death" and similar

terms as fatal to them, and insist upon using them in some secondary meaning. We really cannot see why the Universalist has not as good a right for his use of the term as the Augustinian has for his. But now for the Professor's proof of his main position.

He begins, like a skillful rhetorician, with endeavoring to create *a prejudice* in favor of his view and against that of his opponents. The primary and original sense of the words, he tells us, is "low," "narrow," "sensual," "sensuous," "materializing," "*gross*," "*degrading.*" The secondary sense of the words on the contrary, he tells us, is "figurative," "metaphorical," "spiritual," "metaphysical," "higher," "deeper," "pregnant." (pp. 21–26.) He uses in fact so many captivating expressions to describe the secondary sense of the words, and so many depreciating terms to describe their primary sense, that we feel quite ashamed of this poor primary sense until we begin to think that language was in its origin the gift of God to man; that the primary sense was therefore the sense which God put upon words; that the secondary sense was afterwards developed or created by man, and that therefore it is scarcely becoming in us to speak of the primary sense of language in the "low" and "degrading" way that Mr. Bartlett does. We think that we may use language either in a primary or a secondary sense without using it in a "low" or "degrading" sense in either application, and that the only real degradation of language is the *improper use of it*, such as we maintain Prof. Bartlett has made throughout his learned work from beginning to end, where he tries to force upon the terms of future punishment a secondary meaning which they were never intended to bear.

But he tells us they *were* intended to bear this secondary meaning. What is his proof? He tells us that the secondary use of the terms in question is their "common use, and the clear Scripture use of the terms," and that it is so "by the agreement of the best lexicographers." (pp. 21, 41.) Well, here we come to plain ground, which we are always glad to do. We meet Mr. Bartlett's assertion with a flat denial. We say that the *primary use of the terms is their common use both in ordinary life and in Scripture, and that their secondary use is their uncommon and exceptional use.* For proof of our assertion we will not laboriously collect three or four hundred instances, or three or four thousand instances which with more trouble we could readily do, where

UMI

the terms are used in their primary sense, and parade this immense assemblage of phrases before the bewildered eyes of our readers as a triumphant proof of our position. This is what Prof. Bartlett has done. He has ransacked Scripture and common literature for instances where the terms are taken in their secondary sense, and has brought forward a very formidable looking array. He might have filled his volume with similar instances extracted from the libraries of the world without advancing a single step in proof of his position. His array of phrases may dazzle ignorant readers, but they can deceive no one else.

When we want to know the common use of a word our simple reference is to those "best lexicographers" whom Mr. Bartlett claims for himself, but whom we will quote against him. These are men who have made words their study, and have in their dictionaries given us the result of such study, and it is our part to open their dictionaries when we want to know the various meanings of words, and which are their common and which their unusual significations. Why is it that Mr. Bartlett, who has evidently closely studied Webster's Dictionary, and who more than once claims Webster on his side, has never, so far as we remember, quoted Webster? Webster is an American author, now the first authority for the grand language which seems destined to become the language of the world; and yet we do not recollect that Mr. Bartlett has ever quoted his senses of the terms in question; which would have saved the Professor an immensity of trouble! What he has not done we will do. We are thus precluded from displaying any little knowledge we may have of English literature, but we are satisfied that we are taking a much better method of satisfying the English reader. We confine ourselves, solely for the sake of brevity, to the phrase "death."

We will thank our readers to open the last edition of Webster's Dictionary of the English language, if they have it: if not, they must take our word for what we say. Mr. Bartlett will be able, and doubtless willing, to correct us if we are wrong. Well, then, we will tell our readers that among the *seven different meanings* which Webster attaches to the word "death," *that meaning which Mr. Bartlett attaches to it and tells us is its common meaning is not found at all.* It is only in a note appended in small type where he gives the meaning of phrases connected with

death that he gives Mr. Bartlett's sense of the word, and *in that note he confines this use of it to Scripture!* On the authority of Webster, then, we tell our readers that the meaning attached by Mr. Bartlett to "death," and by him stated to be its common sense, *is a sense nearly unknown to the English language.* This point settles the Professor's references to other authorities.

"The Scriptures," he very properly tells us, "everywhere speak in the language of the people," and Webster, we suppose, represents "the best lexicographers." (pp. 23, 41.) But if any doubt as to the usage of Scripture still lurks in any one's mind, we would only ask such to open Cruden's Concordance to the Bible, or any similar book, at this word "death," and take the first ten or the first hundred references in it and see in how many the word is used in its primary, and in how many it is used in Mr. Bartlett's secondary sense. We venture at a guess to say that the proportion of the latter to the former will not be one in twenty. Prof. Bartlett, how can you call your secondary sense of "death" its common sense?

We freely allow that there are whole classes of passages where this and similar terms are to be taken in their secondary meaning. But we also say that in all such passages abundant proof is given to the most cursory reader that the terms are, and must be, and can only be, taken in a secondary meaning. We chiefly find the secondary sense in such circumstances as these. Some person *well known to be in possession of physical life*, applies to himself, or has applied to him by others, terms drawn from the loss of physical life in order to describe in the strongest phraseology the apparently hopeless condition in which he is placed. *His being well-known to be alive at the time he is thus spoken of is the reader's safeguard against any misinterpretation of the terms.* Thus Job exclaims that he is "broken," "destroyed," "poured out," "slain," "torn," that his "days are extinct:" but then we know all the time that his *life* was not allowed to be hurt (ch. 2: 6), and that therefore the primary sense of these words is *here* inadmissable. Again, Jeremiah exclaims that his "bones are broken," that he is "pulled in pieces," that he is "slain," "destroyed," "his life cut off:" but then we are expressly told that he was a living man at the time, and *therefore* we know that we are not to take these strong expressions in their primary signification. Or, *the very phrase itself* shows us that we are not to take it in its primary and common sense. Thus when we are told of people

"broken with *words*," "broken with *sorrow*," "lacerated with *grief*," "melted with *emotion*," "drowned in *sorrow*," we see as a matter of course that the various phrases are not to be taken in their ordinary meaning. Neither "words" nor "sorrow" literally break a man's bones: nor does "grief" lacerate his body as a tiger or a lion does: nor does "emotion" possess the liquefying power of fire: nor is "sorrow" the water either of land or sea; and, therefore, we know that we are not to take the terms in their primary sense. But under other and ordinary circumstances these and similar terms as a matter of course take their primary and ordinary meaning.

There are whole classes of documents, such as all directly or indirectly connected with law and jurisprudence, where this secondary sense is wholly inadmissible. If we heard a criminal condemned by a judge to death gravely pleading that his physical existence should not be taken from him because he had understood the legal penalty of "death" in a secondary sense, it is quite possible that he might be saved from the scaffold and the hangman; but it would only be by his being sent to a Lunatic Asylum as an incurable madman. That God's jurisprudence should be interpreted in a similar way, his awful penalty of sin explained by the tropes of poetry and the hyperbole of grief, is an outrage even of a graver kind because mixed up with a higher destiny and the Great Judge of the universe. *Yet such is "Prof. Bartlett's commentary upon the laws of God!"*

Shall we answer Mr. Bartlett out of his own mouth? Shall we show from his own words that he feels and knows right well that all his labored argument is mere special pleading, and that the edifice he has built up with so much pains is but a child's house of cards which a breath can blow down? Shall we bring him forward incautiously confessing that that primary sense of the word "death" which he has stigmatized as "low" and "sensual," and has affected to all but obliterate from "common use, and Scripture, and the best lexicographers," is its "*explicit*" and "*unambiguous*" *sense when applied to future punishment?* We will.

At p. 386 he is quoting from the book of Enoch an account of future punishment. Of "sinners ripened in guilt," this apocryphal writer tells us: "They shall be with the wicked, and like them, but *their souls shall not be put to death* in the day of judgment, nor shall they come out from hence." Mr. Bartlett's pithy and excellent comment on this description of the genuine Augustinian doctrine of the eternal life of misery of the lost is—"*there is no ambiguity here.*" About what does he allow that there is no ambiguity? Upon the sense of the word "death." In what sense does he allow that it is here used without any ambiguity? *In its primary sense?* The statement in the book of Enoch that souls shall not be put to death in the judgment implies, beyond any doubt, according to Mr. Bartlett, that souls shall not hereafter lose their physical existence. The loss of physical existence then; *i. e.*, the primary sense of the word death, is allowed by Mr. Bartlett to be its indubitable, unambiguous sense when applied to future punishment! But this is all that we contend for, and this is what he has been strenuously arguing against through his labored volume! Mr. Bartlett has refuted himself. He reminds us of the child who has with great pains built up a house of cards, and just when it was close to completion with an unlucky jerk of his elbow leveled it to the ground.

But besides the plain and primary sense of the terms used in Scripture for future punishment, and which no learning or ingenuity can set aside, we have other and decisive reasons for rejecting Mr. Bartlett's theory as contradictory to Scripture and slanderous in the highest degree to the character of God. Here, as everywhere throughout our review, we fully acquit Mr. Bartlett of any intentional misrepresentation: we only speak of the real effects of his theory. But no tenderness to individual feeling should prevent our speaking openly and boldly of a system which is undermining the faith of multitudes, disgusting devout and holy minds, and sending great numbers to seek their refuge from its horrors in the dangerous and delusive theory of universal restoration. In order to show our readers our additional reasons for rejecting Mr. Bartlett's theory of the second death, it will be necessary to recall their attention *to what he means by it.*

A clear definition of meaning will always be found fatal to error. In haziness and obscurity alone can the teachers of heresy hope to avoid detection. Of such obscurity Mr. Bartlett is not guilty. He tells us what he means by "death" as the future punishment for sinners, and thereby enables us the more readily to expose his mistake. This future "death" then of the sinner to which God will sentence him, is, according to Prof. Bartlett, "the effect of sin," the loss of the soul's "true functional action," its perverted "moral or spiritual state," the "slavery of sin."

UMI

(pp. 36, 41, 49, 69.) It is "that state of separation from God, and from the beatific fruition of God, in which all the higher faculties of human nature are working falsely and discordantly; in which the true end of living is discarded, and its true enjoyment lost; *and in which there is at last the complete extinction*, not of the soul's being, *but of its well-being.*" (p. 46.) It is, according to him, *the continuance and carrying out of a process already going on here.* "Men are accordingly represented *as being even now* in a spiritual condition called 'death,' to be followed by the full and final consummation, which is the second death:" "each state begins here, and is consummated hereafter." (p. 49.) Our readers will perceive from these extracts that the second death according to Prof. Bartlett is nothing else in character than that "death in sin" of which Paul speaks in Eph. 2: 1, carried out to its supposed full consummation, and perpetuated in the future world in hell.

Here, among other things, are three distinct propositions of Mr. Bartlett which are contrary to Scripture. In the first place he affirms that the punishment which God tells us he will inflict after the judgment in hell has already begun upon this earth, and is *in its character and nature* nothing different from what is now, and has from the commencement of moral evil and sin, been going on among sinful men, and, of course, among fallen angels also. In the second place he tells us that the second death is to have the effect of "*consummating*" *and completing that* "*moral wreck*," which before has been only partially effected. In the third place he tells us that *God has ordained* the second death for *the purpose of* "*consummating*" *and completing that* "*moral wreck*," which had not found its consummation before. Such is the theory which this learned Professor advances as the effect of future punishment, and God's object in punishing! *Is this Christianity?* A thousand times we answer, it is a foul slander upon the religion of a wise and holy God.

In the first place it is contradictory to Scripture to say that the future punishment of hell is a continuation, even in a more intensified form, of the punishment already begun here on earth. This is not the teaching of Scripture. Hell is not, according to Scripture, the continuation of a process already begun, but a new process begun after the judgment. It is "*prepared* for the devil and his angels," and for those condemned in the judgment, but until after the judgment neither men nor angels endure it in

any measure or degree. (Matt. 25: 41.) This is very clearly seen from the language of the unclean spirits when on various occasions they were brought into contact with Christ. Thus upon one occasion they asked him—"Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" (Matt. 8: 29.) Their torments had not *begun!* But according to Mr. Bartlett, their torments would have been in full operation and consummated: for if the second death were, as he tells us, "the complete extinction of the soul's well-being, which is, according to him, accompanied with a corresponding extinction of happiness and the presence of misery, then fallen angels, whose "well-being" we should suppose Mr. Bartlett will allow is by this time completely extinguished, would have been in the full endurance of the torments of the second death. But we have their own testimony for saying that those torments have not so much as begun: and we are satisfied that they know their own condition better than Mr. Bartlett does. But if so, the second death is not a process *already begun*, and so falls this proposition of the Professor's theory. *The punishment of the wicked is future*, and such is the uniform testimony of Scripture. (Rom. 2: 5; Mark 1: 24; 2 Thess. 2: 9.) It is therefore a different thing from that "death in sin" and attendant loss of "well-being" with which Mr. Bartlett would fain identify it. It is the punishment which God will inflict upon those who are already and before it falls "dead in sin."

Again, Mr. Bartlett tells us that the second death is *to* "*consummate*" that "moral wreck" and loss of "true functional action" which has here only "begun." Again the case of the fallen angels meets our Professor and rudely contradicts his theory. Are the fallen angels but novices in evil? Are not "all the higher faculties" of their "nature working as falsely and as discordantly" as it is possible for them to do? Such is certainly the idea which Scripture leads us to hold. But, if so, the second death is not for the "extinction" of a "*well-being*" which is already extinguished, for the destruction of a "true functional action," which is already destroyed as completely as it is possible for it to be. The second death, Prof. Bartlett, is for devils as well as reprobate men, and the utter "moral wreck" of their once noble nature shows us that this second death has not such an object as you propose for it.

Once more we reject as a foul slander upon a holy God the idea which Mr. Bartlett's theory brings prominently forward,

UMI

that God has ordained a punishment one of whose objects is the "consummation" of the destruction of the "*well*-being" of his creatures, the utter loss of the "true functional action" of the powers with which he originally endowed them, the production of a yet falser and more discordant working of the lofty faculties implanted in them by their Maker. We would suppose that the very recording of such as one of the objects of the second death would have startled Prof. Bartlett as a blasphemy unworthy of a Christian teacher. At all events we denounce it as such. God does not take up and complete the guilty work of fallen men and angels! We will not permit a theory far more derogatory to him than the old exploded heresy of the Manichæans to take any longer its place in our theology as a doctrine of the Gospel. The poor heretic of the third century fancied *two* eternal principles, one good, one evil, and his eternal principle of good only endured evil *because he could not help it.* But Mr. Bartlett and his school picture the One True Eternal Good God as *adding to, completing, consummating the evil which the abuse of their free will by angels and men first introduced.* He not only consummates moral evil, but he also, according to Mr. Bartlett, *perpetuates* it forever! And is this the boasted *orthodoxy* which it is heresy to oppose? It is itself a heresy, introduced into the Church when Christian Fathers forgot the warning of Paul against *philosophy*, and, with the intention of supporting the Gospel by philosophy, corrupted and depraved it thereby.

We had intended when we began our review to notice Mr. Bartlett's attempted support of his theory of the second death by his theory of the natural immortality of the soul. As we proceeded however we saw that we could not do this and at the same time give to the first and main division of his work that attention which was due to it. We preferred therefore to confine ourselves to the latter. We have written boldly and openly what we honestly thought, and now take our leave of our kind American friends with the earnest prayer that we and they separated by an intervening ocean may be joined in the bonds of the everlasting gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

THE ERRORS OF THE AGE.

Let us not be unjust, either to an individual or an age. Let us be charitable to both; not discoloring, nor distorting, nor gathering up hasty inferences; but speaking calmly, remembering that we ourselves are part of the age, and so, doubly bound, not to be mere haters of the false, but lovers of the true; not satirists nor slanderers, but men alive to the magnitude of the very least of good or evil, and desirous not to be mere assailants of the evil, but upbuilders of the good.

He who sees nothing but error in an age is quite as likely to be mistaken as he who sees nothing but truth; and yet, on the other hand, he who sees nothing but *progress* in our time is, beyond all doubt, afflicted with as sorrowful a delusion as he who sees in it nothing but *retrogression.*

It is not everything done in an age that is part of the age; and an error may be *in* the age, and yet not *of* it. It may be an isolation, an exception, an excrescence, not a characteristic; an exotic, not a thing of native growth. The solitary rock in mid-ocean is not a specimen of the sea; one weed is not a specimen of the garden, nor one palm-tree of the desert. One hasty word does not represent the man; nor does one blundering sentence stamp the character of the book. Let us deal fairly with the age and its utterances. As every freckle is not leprosy, and every leprosy is not epidemic, so every imperfection is not deadly, and even that which is deadly may perhaps stand alone. Before we can attach the error to the age, or the age to the error, let us see that the error is widespread or deep-rooted, or chronic, or influential, giving tone and complexion to theology, or literature, or public opinion; not a mere summer-ripple, raised by a momentary breeze, but a broad tidal wave moving shoreward, and imparting its brackishness to the stream up which it is noiselessly working.

It is well that this should be kept in mind in order to prevent either an over-estimate or an under-estimate of the evil.

Besides, the *greatness* of an error is one thing, and its *capacity* for mischief is quite another. That which in one age, or kingdom, or stage of the human mind and conscience, would be po-

UMI

tent for evil, in another age, or kingdom, or stage of the human mind and conscience, is totally innocuous. What a book of error and cunningly-devised fable is the Koran! But is its power of injury commensurate with the magnitude of its errors? A thousand years ago it was a book of power; in our age it is feeble as the voice or hand of a child. In Bagdad, or Cairo, or Constantinople, it is powerful; in London or Paris, in Dublin or Edinburg, it is impotent. Among the oriental races, even half a century ago it went forth and was responded to by the eastern mind and conscience of that generation; now the scepticism of the age has so told upon the Moslem race, that their prophet's volume is beginning to lose its hold upon multitudes; conscience has passed into a new stage, and it no longer responds to the appeals which once would have stirred all its depths.

In fact, we may say that in many cases it is the magnitude of the error that is its weakness. Were it less in size, or less audaciously untrue; were it less audible, less visible, it would be more pernicious and more infectious, more seductive and perilous. So that often that which error gains in greatness it loses in influence and efficiency. Of two lies, or systems of lies, it is frequently the minute and half invisible, not the imposing and colossal that is the more extensively mischievous. The volcano thunders and smokes, but you see it and keep aloof; the scorpion, hidden under the stone on which you are sitting, or the snake, dropping from the bough under whose shade you are cooling yourself, strikes its tiny fang into your limb, and the little drop of invisible poison pours death into your veins. A Voltaire rages and blasphemes. He proclaims the Bible to be a fable of the priesthood. You stand afar off, and his voice reaches you not. Another man rises, clad in priestly garb, uttering no blasphemy, and professing to venerate religion. He blandly suggests that the Bible is "unhistorical." Unhistorical! Yes; that is all. It is a smooth word, but under it is hidden the poison of the adder. By "unhistorical" he *seems* to the unpracticed ear to mean only at variance with common history; but he really means by it all that Voltaire and Paine did—fabulous and false; no truer than the Koran or the Shasters; the weak invention of some unknown impostors, who, like the camel-driver of Mecca, or Manu the son of Brachmar, compiled volumes of miracles, whose genuineness they did not themselves believe. Satan, as the Prince of darkness, had overreached himself; he is now

clothing himself in the garb of an angel of light, and arraying error in the seemly raiment of science and philosophy, and poetry or humanity; he is sending it abroad to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. The vulgar blasphemies of other days would not serve his purpose now, so he makes a selection of the least offensive; and even for that select number he is at pains to provide a more polite and less audacious phraseology, which will not altogether shock even religious men, and which will yet lodge in their minds the seeds of the same remorseless infidelity that, from the beginning, has set itself to overthrow the book of God. He has picked up the spent shafts of Celsus, and Porphyry, and Blount, and Toland, and Hume, and Bolingbroke, and Voltaire; and having painted, feathered, pointed, and poisoned them anew, he puts them not into the hand of the scoffer, not into the quiver of the profane, but into the hand and quiver of men who are called friends of religion and ministers of Christ. The goddess of reason has put on the mitre now, and speaks from sacred ground. It was once but the infidelity of the press and the platform, it is the infidelity of the pulpit and the altar now.

Thus many of the errors of the present day go forth with an authority which they never had before; and are listened to by thousands who denounce the infidelities of the past. A new standing-point, new vantage-ground has been secured for error. An undue and undeserved (not to say dishonest) position has been attained by it; and the resurrection of exploded sophistries is received as the discovery of new and irresistible argument.

Besides all this there is great difficulty in taking the measurements of many modern errors, of ascertaining their exact dimensions and character and tendencies. They are so intangible and indefinite. You can lay hands on a skeleton of however gigantic dimensions, but no one can undertake to deal with a spectre—a ghost, however imposing in its stature or aspect. You can measure a mountain, but not a cloud, still less a mist; you can grasp the shower-drops, but not a rainbow; you can analyze the light, but not the darkness. So indeed we find it difficult to handle the dreamy abstractions, the incoherent sentimentalisms, the broken reveries, the gorgeous pictorialisms, the swamp-born exhalations which meet us on every side in connection with the "young" theologies and philosophic transcendentalisms of the day. They raise the cry of liberality, progress, geniality, large-

UMI

mindedness, freedom from old-world fetters, and they brand the defense of old creeds as the mere poverty of intellect or the timorous conservatism of men who are too stupid, too indolent, too cowardly to think for themselves. Their battle-word is "young England," or "young Germany," or "young France;" as if they had monopolized the youth of the world; or perhaps "young faith," "young truth," "young Christendom," as if *in* them and *through* them theology and philosophy were renewing their prime—assuming a nobler form, and brushing aside the obsoletisms of a trammeled and uninstructed past, to emerge into a largeness and a liberty such as Moses or Daniel, such as Paul or John, had never known. And may we not predict that the watchword "young Christendom" will soon be drowned in that of "young Rome" or "young Babylon," when the fermenting theologies and philosophies of the day shall subside into one dark creed of satanic error, a compound of positivism and negativism, of supernaturalism and atheism, of superstition and infidelity, of all beliefs and of no belief; a strange dualism of religion and irreligion, of spiritualism, and secularism, of socialism and despotism, which will unite the world in submission to the great anti-Christian enemy of God? That which now worships unsanctified genius, and to whom goodness apart from high intellect is a term of reproach, which shelters itself under the name of progressive theology, or philosophic eclecticism, or a re-adjustment of Christianity, will develop into a disbelief of all fixed creeds, it may be into a refined heathenism—certainly into a denial of the one Jehovah and his incarnate Son.

I enter into no comparison between the present and the past; nor do I attempt to ascertain what and how much we may have gained or lost; yet let me say that it ought to be acknowledged that the modern developments of evil have been met with large compensations and counteractions in the growths and evolutions of good; and that the augmented and intensified energy of error has been, in no small measure, the result of the new life and power which have, by the all-quickening Spirit, been infused into truth. That which was "from above" came first, and was met immediately by that which is "from beneath." The resurrection of the false was preceded by the resurrection of the true. While truth slept, error also slept; when truth awoke, error also awoke; and the aggression of the former was the signal for the aggression of the latter. The armies of hell have mustered because the hosts of heaven had already taken the field.

I do not attempt either to enumerate or to classify the errors of the age; I simply point out a few of the more prominent and perilous—those especially that have both root and seed, not broken branches, nor cut-down stems, but living and productive. It is of errors connected with man's religious being, or with religion itself, that I mean to speak; understanding by religion, not a cluster of abstractions, but *the acting out of each man's personal relationship to God.*

The religious movements of our day have not been the mere diffusion of certain abstractions, the mere effervescence of certain doctrines. No truth, however true, could of itself accomplish what has been wrought within these forty years. God himself has come down. It is a divine voice that has spoken, and a divine hand that has been working. It is no mere summer breath that has swept over the churchyard, and clothed its heaving turf with verdure; it is the Spirit of the living God that has gone into the tombs and touched the dry bones, and made dead men live.

Yet this is what the world not merely overlooks, but rejects. It is the admission of *a divine element* into any movement, or any truth, or any dogma, that is refused. I do not say a *supernatural* element; for, strange to tell, there are not a few, even of the educated and the literary, that admit the supernatural while they reject the divine; nay, receive the former on purpose to be able to resist and deny the latter: as we see in the tens of thousands in America, on the Continent, and in our own islands, who are the enthusiastic devotees of Spiritualism and all its spirit-rapping delusions.

The expulsion, then—I do not say of a supernatural, or spiritual, or transcendental, but of a strictly *divine* element from our faith, either in its origin, its basis, or its contents—is what the fallen intellect has decided on as indispensable to its own free action in the investigation of truth. The recognition of a divine element would be considered as vitiating the whole process of inquiry, and the absence of such would be regarded as a necessary condition of authentic faith, and an essential criterion of the genuineness of the truth believed. For it is not speculation or opinion that the natural heart so desperately hates, but God himself, and whatever contains God.

UMI

There are some who say "there is no God;" but they say it with a flippancy that disappoints and disconcerts us. If they suppose honestly that they have made this discovery, they, of all men, ought to be the most profoundly sorrowful. That this vast universe has no head, and that they themselves have no parent, is one of the most melancholy of all discoveries. That what we see and hear and touch is the terminus, the ultimatum or limit to that which is; that the infinite is an impossibility; that the sun has no brighter fountain than itself out of which it came; that the beautiful in nature has nothing more beautiful after whose image it was designed; that the lovable in man and man's world is the highest type and widest circle of the lovable; that the stream has no fountain more transparent than itself; that a parent's heart has no prototype or model in an infinite heart above; what a dark and sad discovery! What a disappointment, what a blank, what an infinite loss! To be cut off from the possibility of so much hope and beauty and perfection and love; to be confined within the narrow circle of the finite; surely this is sad! Yet those men who profess to have made this discovery are not sorrowful! Do they believe in their own discovery? Or is it the thought of having succeeded in expelling the divine from their creed that has cheered them into mirth?

There are others who say there is a God, but there is no intercourse between him and his creatures. The finite and the infinite are separated by a wide gulf. He has not spoken to man. His only speech is that of nature. There is no divine teaching save that of nature: and men talk of interrogating nature in order to learn the mind of the Creator. The sun and stars speak, but God is dumb. The seas and rivers speak, but God is dumb. The hills and forests speak, but God is dumb. Yet these men who have thus expelled the divine element from the circle of their being, seem not to miss it. They do not seem sensible of the awful loss which must be sustained by the creature in being cut off from all direct, all personal communication with God.

There are others who affirm that God has spoken, but not *intelligibly*. His words require an earthly interpreter; otherwise they are as dark as they are dangerous; as if God had muffled his words to prevent men hearing them; as if man alone could speak intelligible language! The Bible, they say, needs an interpreter; the Church is the sole interpreter; the priest is the

Church's organ; and only through the Church and the priest can God be made to speak intelligibly to man. And this absence of simplicity, this want of the intelligible and transparent, which in human writings is esteemed a defect and a proof of weakness, is not lamented as a loss and an imperfection, but triumphed in as a perfection and a gain! The divine element of simplicity and clearness which pervades the works of God must be banished from his word; and that without a sigh! The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament shows forth his handiwork; day unto day utters speech, and night unto night teacheth knowledge; so that even the peasant of the field, or the Bedawi of the desert, or the serf of Siberia may see and hear and understand; but the book of God gives no such glorious utterance of intelligible truth, till the Church's voice, more intelligible than that of the Holy Spirit, has spoken—man's speech removing the ambiguities of God, man's rendering legible the illegible handwriting of God; as if it were the Church and not the Lamb slain that had prevailed to open the book; as if it had been the priest and not the Lion of the tribe of Judah that had been found worthy to loose the seals.

But, say others, though God may have in a certain sense spoken *intelligibly*, yet he has not spoken *articulately*. The Bible is no doubt the book of God, but not to the same extent in which *The Faerie Queen* is Spenser's, or *Hamlet*, Shakespeare's, or *Paradise Lost*, Milton's. These works of men contain not only the *thoughts* of the writers, but their words; but as for the Bible, it embodies, no doubt, the *thoughts* of God; but to say that it contains the very words of God, his articulate speech, is unphilosophical in the extreme, and would assume that prophets and apostles were mere unintelligent machines or printing-presses. Suppose it were so, is it a degradation or a hardship for a creature to be a passive instrument in the hand of the God only wise, and would the book produced in this way, at the expense of the creature's liberty for an hour or a day, be less correct and less articulate? But, let the truth be spoken respecting both man and God. Man left to himself, to speak alone and act alone, is in bondage to influences which prevent his being *really himself*, which hamper his free thought, his free speech, his free action. It is only when taken possession of by the free Spirit, when filled with God, that he is truly himself, truly free either in thought or word. These hands are never more free than when the soul

UMI

within moves them; these lips are not slaves, because acting according to the touch of the inner man; these eyes are not machines, because the intellect or the fancy kindles them into eloquent brightness; so the inspired prophet is not a machine, nor a pen, nor an electric wire, because God has come in and awakened his dormant being; because the Holy Spirit has set all his faculties in motion; because the master-hand has taken up the harp and passed his fingers over its silent strings, giving liberty to its imprisoned music, and calling forth a melody which but for that divine touch had been hidden there, in durance dark, unheard and unknown. The expulsion of the divine element from the *words* of Scripture seems to be reckoned by not a few amongst us rather a gain than a loss! The surrender of the perfect in a revelation is made without a sigh.

But, say the men of another class, though God may have spoken intelligibly and articulately, he has not spoken authoritatively. He has given us the Bible as a book of thought—a sort of hand-book or guide-book; but not a statute-book, not a promulgation of peremptory law, or infallible and inexorable truth. By this class of reasoners the divine element of *authority* is struck out, and man is allowed to trifle with the Scriptures, to play fast and loose with their revelations, as if they were the mere utterances of a higher kind of *genius* than that which gave us the *Iliad*, or the *Canterbury Tales*, or *Faust*, or *Locksley Hall*. Beauty, eloquence, lofty thought, tenderness, power, they allow to Scripture, but not authority! They will admire, but not obey. They will listen to its suggestions, but they decline its commands. They will study it, but they will not be bound by it. How this free-and-easy treatment of the Bible is reconcilable with the idea of a revelation from God, I do not now inquire. I point to it simply as another of the eliminations of the divine element from that which is yet recognized as a divine volume. How strangely desirous are some to thrust God out of his own book! How thoroughly they do this by this repudiation of infallibility and authority! And how blind they are to the loss which they themselves thus sustain in being shut out from all certainty by being deprived of all divine authority. [1]

It is hardly possible to read the Bible without feeling how sternly it condemns this laxity. If some of these free-and-easy

[1] We need not stay to show how this free-and-easy dealing with the authority of revelation leads to a free-and-easy theology, a free-and-easy creed, a free-and-easy morality.

commentators would speak out, they would pronounce it the most bigoted of all books. It is so unsparing in its denunciation of error and evil, and so uncompromising in its demands upon men for submission to its teaching. One God, one Christ, one book, one creed, one theology, one religion, one way to salvation! This is its unfaltering utterance from its first verse to its last. "He that believeth shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." It assumes the absolute authority of the Creator. It assumes that as his wisdom is perfect, so all its utterances must be authoritative. It proclaims truth not as an opinion, a speculation, a theory, but a *certainty*. It takes unhesitatingly for granted that all *error* is *sin;* that truth is *one*, and never becomes antiquated or obsolete, but always blooms in immortal youth, no length of years or ages availing to extract the divine element from what God has once spoken. *Unhistorical*, as some have, by means of ancient hieroglyphics or modern arithmetic, tried to prove it, it calmly, yet boldly claims to be one true history of heaven and earth, of things visible and invisible. *Mythical*, as others call it, it spreads before us the naked, rugged facts of four thousand years, each one a veritable fragment of humanity, the embodiment, not of dreams or fantasies, but of living truth. *Unphilosophical* as others affirm it to be, it presents to us its revelations as developments of the one authentic philosophy of mind and matter, of good and evil; not solicitous to defend itself from the charges of boasting or of foolishness which self-sufficient assailants have brought against it; and making no apology for announcing itself as the one volume which, like its Author, is immortal and incorruptible. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of our God shall stand forever."

That this disposition to eliminate or extract the divine element from the Bible is the root of wide-spread error, is obvious; and that the errors are deep and perilous is no less plain. The tendency of each is, in a greater or less degree, to get rid of a personal God, or to remove him to a distance from us, or to interpose a cloud between him and us, so that the reader of his book shall no longer meet him face to face in that book, but simply certain abstractions, certain algebraic symbols, or unknown quantities, which may or may not mean anything, which lay no hold upon the conscience, either for alarming or pacifying, which

UMI

still leave the soul without a living personality either to worship or to love.

But this line of error goes further than the expulsion of the divine from the word of God. There is the transference of this to the creature, the deifying of man, the robbing God in order to enrich and magnify man. "Ye shall not surely die" was Satan's insidious commencement of the rejection of the divine element from what God had spoken; his second step was the promised transference of the divine to the human, "ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." As man ripens in iniquity, and as the errors we have dwelt upon unfold themselves, this daring transference—this full-blown impiety of anti-Christ—this last and worst form of man's infidelity will exhibit itself, both in the Church and in the world, consummating the evils of the perilous times of which the apostle has given us so appalling a picture.

Transfer the divine element to creation at large, you have *pantheism;* to images of brass or stone, you have *idolatry;* to the priest or the church, you have *Romanism;* to forms and rites and sacraments, and you have *tractarianism;* to the visible things of the senses, and you have *materialism;* to the invisibilities of disembodied spirits, and you have *spiritualism;* to the intellect, and you have *rationalism;* to the fancy, and you have religious *pictorialism;* to the feelings, and you have *religious sentimentalism;* transfer it to *man*, simply as man, and you have the last form of anti-Christ—the dethronization of the divine, the enthronization of the human, the rejection of the God-man and the exaltation of a man into his place as the only Messiah of the race, the world's only Redeemer and King.

Most subtle is the error that would have us deal with religious truth as a mere bundle of abstractions or ideas or speculations, of which every man is at liberty to form his own opinion. The essence of the Bible, the Alpha and Omega of revelation, is not truth alone, nor religion alone, but *Christianity*, a Christianity which is not presented to us merely as the communication of doctrines, but as the settlement of the great personal question between the sinner and God, the solution of the difficulty which law and conscience necessarily raise as to righteousness and grace.

And what is Christianity? Not metaphysics, not mysticism, not a compilation of guesses at truth. It is the history of the

seed of the woman—that seed the Word made flesh; the Word made flesh the revelation of the invisible Jehovah, the representative of the eternal God, the medium of communication between the Creator and the creature, between earth and heaven.

And of this Christianity what is the essential characteristic, the indispensable feature from first to last? Is it incarnation or blood shedding?[1] Is it the cradle or the cross? Is it the scene at Bethlehem or at Golgotha? Assuredly the latter! "Eli, Eli, Lama Sabachthani" is no mere outcry of suffering nature, the cross is no mere scene of human martyrdom, and the great sepulchre is no mere Hebrew tomb. It is only through *blood shedding* that conscience is purged; it is only at the *cross* that the sinner can meet with God; it is the *cross* that knits heaven and earth together; it is the cross that bears up the collapsing universe; it is the pierced hand that holds the golden sceptre; it is at Calvary that we find the open gate of paradise regained, and the gospel is good news to the sinner of liberty to enter in. Let men with the newly sharpened axes of rationalism do their utmost to hew down that cross, it will stand in spite of them. Let them apply their ecclesiastical paint-brush, and daub it all over with the most approved of mediæval pigments to cover its nakedness, its glory will shine through all. Let them scoff at the legal transference of the sinner's guilt to a divine substitute, and of that surety's righteousness to the sinner, as a Lutheran delusion or a Puritan fiction, that mutual transference, that wondrous exchange, will be found to be wrapped up with Christianity itself. Let those who, like Cain of old, shrink from the touch of sacrificial blood and mock the "religion of the shambles," purge their consciences with the idea of God's universal fatherhood, and try to wash their robes and make them white in something else than the blood of the Lamb; to us, as to the saints of other days, there is but one purging of the conscience, one security for pardon, one way of access, one bond of reconciliation, one healing of our wounds—the death of him on whom the chastisement of our peace was laid; and one everlasting song "unto him who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

When we speak of error or of truth, we speak of an idea, an abstraction. But the Bible does not deal in mere ideas. It has an orbit of its own, a region of its own, a world of its own—very

[1] That is, the pouring out of the soul, or life, unto death.—Ed. Quar.

different from that into which the wisdom of men ever enters—an orbit of which God's throne is the centre, a world of *reality*, a region of *personality*, in which the distant becomes the near, the invisible the visible, and the shadowy the substantial and the palpable. In the Bible we look the living God in the face; and he fixes his gaze on us. Divine revelation, as developed in Christianity, is not the elucidation of certain unpractical or impersonal questions; but the adjustment of all that is *personal* between us and God, so that we shall know, of a certainty, that in believing we are forgiven all our iniquities. Christianity is not the mere improvement of natural religion, nor the correction of certain philosophical obliquities, nor the removal of certain heathen misrepresentations as to the character of God; but the settlement of the great controversy between us and God, the re-adjustment of our relationship to him, upon a basis and in a way which not merely secures future reconciliation for us, but gives us the present assurance of it, with all the peace, and the liberty, and the holiness which that assurance brings.

It is round the Christ of God that all truth revolves; and hence all error connected either with his person or his work must be perilous. The revelation of the Christ *begins at the beginning*, and sweeps round a vast circle. It takes up the whole question between the sinner and God, and gives judgment upon every part of it. It condemns man, and justifies God. It pronounces authoritatively, both as to the way of life and the way of death. It does not accept *earnestness* as a substitute for truth, nor a justification or extenuation of error. It does not show man how to lay the foundation of the great settlement for eternity, it lays the foundation and presents us with everything on God's side as finished. It begins by announcing what God has done, before it says one word of what man is to do; it shows us God as the doer and the giver—man as the receiver, setting aside unsparingly every religion and every doctrine which would make man either in whole or in part his own savior; or which would make worship or service a thing of proxy, and shift the personality and the responsibility of the great transaction between the soul and God, to a priest, or a minister, or a church, or a ceremony, or a sacrament, or a creed.

Thus it is that, through the belief of God's testimony to the great propitiation, we are not only justified, but we *know*, we are *assured*, that we are; and thus it is that, through the simple

reception of the glad tidings, all the gladness which they contain is transferred to us. Believing, we *rejoice;* we *are* saved; we *have* everlasting life.

The revelation of the Christ embraces in it the revelation of the Church in him, as his temple, his body, his bride; his present witness on earth, and the watcher for his return in glory. This Church, even on earth, is no mere association of men holding certain opinions, no mere corporation favored with certain privileges, but a body chosen and called out of a world of darkness. Its legislation is divine, not human; its laws are not its own ideas of expediency and order, but the commandments of its Head. The essence of its constitution is not socialism, nor republicanism, nor despotism, nor anarchy; but an unearthly organization founded on entire subjection to its heavenly Head; an organization working itself out in order, unity, growth, fruitfulness, love, and zeal. Its ministers are not philosophers, nor lecturers, nor theorists, nor humorists, nor orators, nor priests; but messengers of God's free love, expositors of the Word, and shepherds of the flock, and executors of government and discipline. Its members are not politicians, nor lovers of pleasure, nor worshipers of gold, nor men who are trying to make the best of both worlds; but men alive from the dead, through the power of the Holy Spirit, possessors of a heavenly peace, bearers of a cross, yet heirs of a kingdom, strangers upon the earth, yet citizens of the New Jerusalem, which cometh down from God out of heaven.

All the errors of the age we cannot hope to shun; yet many more we might be delivered from, did we trust more to the Heavenly Teacher and his heavenly teaching; for surely the promise is to us, "He will guide you into all truth.... Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and know all things." Let us learn each truth directly from the Master's lips, so shall it be vital and productive; otherwise we shall be the possessors but of a second-hand, and therefore a second-rate religion—a reflected religion, with all the coldness of moonshine, but none of the warmth of the glorious sun; a timid and shriveled piety that does no mighty deeds, and speaks no words of power—that will not even stand the tear and wear of life, far less brave the brunt of battle, or compete for the martyr's crown.

It is *truth* that makes us free, for all error is bondage. If, then, you would be free men, grasp the truth, tenaciously, bravely,

UMI

calmly; bind it round you as a girdle, treasure it in your heart of hearts. "Buy the truth and sell it not;" that is, get it at any cost, part with it never. Error is sin, for which every man shall give an account to God; and *sin* is no mere mischance or misfortune that claims pity only, but not condemnation nor punishment; else what means the fiery law; what means the cross of the sin-bearer; what means the great white throne; what means the everlasting fire?[1] "Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth," remembering your high calling, as witnesses for the truth and the True One. Let neither your words nor your lives give any uncertain sound. Every man to whom the Bible comes is responsible for believing all the truth which that revelation proclaims, and for rejecting all the error which it condemns. Cleave, then, to the Word of the living God; and sit, as teachable disciples, at the feet of him who has said learn of me. So shall you be led into all truth and delivered from all error. Otherwise, how shall you stand, either now or in the evil day? How shall you hope to win the victory, or receive the recompense to him that overcometh? We once saw a painting—the representation of the last struggle of an ancient king. He and three of his pursuers are on horseback, engaged hand to hand in deadly battle. Even with such odds, he looks a man, for stature and strength and sinew, fitted to win the day. But the shield which he holds in his left hand is broken; the sword which he grasps so firmly in his right, is snapped in two, and his helmet has fallen from his head. With half a sword, with a splintered shield, without a helmet—how can he, old warrior as he is, win the field? What can he do but die? Let us in our great battle of life remember this, and if we would overcome, let us take the *whole* armor of God—the shield, the breastplate, the helmet, and the sword. So shall we fight; so shall we be more than conquerors; and the God of peace shall bruise Satan under our feet shortly.

The day of error will not always last. The day of truth is coming. For we know that though in the last days perilous times shall come; yet beyond these there is the splendor of the most glorious day that ever dawned upon the earth; for he that shall come, will come, and will not tarry. He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.—*London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy.*

[1] See Jude 7; 2 Pet. 2: 6; 2 Thess. 1: 8-10.

HADES AND HEAVEN.

By Eld. James H. Whitmore, East Shelby, N. Y.

Two widely different theories concerning the present state of the dead are entertained among those Protestants who believe in the immortality of the soul. The most popular of these can scarcely be called a theory of the intermediate state, since it recognizes no middle condition, but at once assigns the newly disembodied soul to the highest heaven or to the lowest hell. This will appear from the statements of some of its most distinguished advocates. Dr. Adam Clarke, commenting on 2 Cor. 5: 6, says:

"The apostle gives no intimation of an intermediate state between being at home in the body and being present with the Lord."

Thomas Scott says:

"If our sins be forgiven and our hearts renewed unto holiness, *heaven will be the rest of our souls*, whilst our bodies will be secretly hid in the grave."[1]

Albert Barnes says:

"The Christian when he leaves the body is at once with the Lord Jesus."[2] "Our pious friends that have died are now happy. They are with God. A father, or mother, or friend, that may have left us, is there—there in perfect felicity."[3]

Prof. Bartlett says:

"It is taught in the New Testament, that not only the soul of the Christian *might*, but that it *would*, enter and enjoy the presence of Christ at death; and that the continuance of its life here in the body actually delays its enjoyment of Christ's immediate presence in glory."...."It is affirmed that the believer, upon the death of the body, actually does enter heavenly blessedness at once."[4]

A well known author, but recently deceased, says:

[1] Observations on Job 14. [2] Remarks on 2 Cor. 5. [3] Note on Matt. 22: 32.
[4] *Life and Death Eternal*, pp. 196, 199.

UMI

"The sainted dead *are already* before the throne, and serve God day and night in his temple."[1]

Benson has this note on Eccl. 12: 7:

"The soul of man, so called because of its spiritual or immaterial nature, shall return unto God, into his presence, and before his tribunal, THAT *it may there be* SENTENCED TO ITS EVERLASTING HABITATION, either to abide with God forever if approved by him, or otherwise to be ETERNALLY SHUT OUT OF HIS PRESENCE AND FAVOR."

The state of the impenitent dead is thus described by President Edwards:

"As soon as ever the soul parts from the body, from that moment the case will be absolutely determined; there will then be an end forever to all hope, to everything that men hang upon this life; the soul then shall know certainly that it is to be miserable to all eternity without any remedy. It shall see that God is its enemy; it shall see its Judge clothed in his wrath and vengeance. Then its misery will begin, it will that moment be swallowed up in despair; the great gulf will be fixed between it and happiness, the door of mercy will be forever shut up, *the irrevocable sentence will be passed.*".... "We may well suppose that when a wicked man dies, his soul is seized by wicked angels; and that they are round his bed ready to seize the miserable soul as soon as it is parted from the body. And with what fierceness and fury do those cruel spirits fly upon their prey; and the soul shall be left in their hands! There shall be no good angels to guard and defend it. God will take no care of it; there is nothing to help it against those cruel spirits that shall lay hold of it, carry it to hell, *there to torment it forever.*"[2]

These extracts suffice to show that the theory under consideration renders the 'resurrection of the body' unnecessary, and the resurrection of *the dead* impossible; whilst it entirely ignores both the necessity and the fact of a judgment-day for the assembled world. The detention theory in a measure avoids both of these errors, by making the present state of the dead properly an *intermediate* state, both as respects the happiness of the righteous and the misery of the wicked. Its advocates uniformly represent the necessity of a resurrection of the body, and of a day of judgment. It may be stated thus: All souls when separated from the body at death go to *hades.* This 'spirit-world' is divided by an impassable gulf into two divisions called paradise

[1] H. Mattison. *Bible Doc. of Im.*, p. 35. [2] *Works*, vol. II., pp. 880-883.

and *tartarus.* All good souls go to paradise; all wicked souls go to *tartarus.* In these respective places they remain until the reunion of soul and body at the general resurrection, when the former will rise to higher joys in heaven, and the latter will sink to deeper misery in *gehenna.* Dr. Fitch, in his work on *The Intermediate State*, sums up the doctrine in these words:

"Now, of the things that I have spoken, this is the sum: At death, the body returns to the dust, as it was; the soul goes to the world of spirits, called by the general name of *hades;* the good to that happy part of it called paradise, where they are blessed; the bad are cast into outer darkness, where they are in torments."

The theory which assigns all souls immediately after death to their final destination in heaven or hell may not inaptly be termed radical; whilst that which allows of a detention in *hades* may as justly be termed conservative. Both of these theories claim the support of Scripture; both acknowledge the immateriality and immortality of the soul; both make heaven the final abode of the righteous; and both consign the wicked to endless misery in hell. Holding these points in common, neither party questions the 'orthodoxy' of the other.

It is interesting to observe with what ease each theory is in turn demolished by the advocates of the other. Mr. John Wesley was an able advocate of the conservative view. In his sermon on "Dives and Lazarus," he says:

"It is, indeed, very generally supposed, that the souls of good men, as soon as they are discharged from the body, go directly to heaven; but this opinion has not *the least foundation in the oracles of God.* On the contrary, our Lord says to Mary, after the resurrection, 'Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father' in heaven. But he had been in paradise, according to his promise to the penitent thief: 'This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' Hence, it is plain that paradise is not heaven. It is, indeed (if we may be allowed the expression), the ante-chamber of heaven, where the souls of the righteous remain till, after the general judgment, they are received into glory."[1]

Admitting as the radicals do that Jesus and the penitent thief were together in paradise on the day of the crucifixion; and admitting as they do that *all* righteous souls go at death to this

[1] *Sermons*, vol. II., pp. 416-417.

UMI

same paradise, the argument urged by Mr. Wesley against their theory is unanswerable and irresistible.

A recent writer in advocating the conservative theory, after quoting Acts 2: 34, says:

"David, the man after God's own heart, hath not yet ascended into heaven. We should, then, conclude that none others had. This, Christ says, is true. John 3: 13: 'No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man.' *The dead, then, are not yet in heaven*.... If David hath not ascended to heaven—if no man but Christ hath ascended to heaven—if Christ had been in paradise, but had not been in heaven (when Mary met him at the sepulcher), then paradise is not heaven. The penitent thief went to paradise, but not to heaven. The place to which the souls of the righteous go at death is not heaven." [1]

The argument as against the radical theory is a good one. Arguing from the admitted premises of both parties, the conclusion reached cannot be logically avoided. But in any event the possible triumph of the conservatives is but a partial one. They have indeed succeeded in overthrowing the radical theory, without making any advance toward sustaining their own. They must first establish their premises before we grant their conclusion.

On the other hand, the radical, in replying to the conservative's argument, demolishes the latter's theory without strengthening his own. He cites Luke 23: 43 as proof that the righteous go to heaven when they die. "The passage does not prove this," replies the conservative. "It proves rather that the righteous go at death to be with Christ in paradise. He said to the thief, 'Thou shalt be with me in paradise,' not in heaven." "Where is paradise?" asks the radical. "In *hades*," is the reply. "Those who mistake paradise for *heaven*, and *hades* for *hell*, may be perplexed to reconcile the two expressions of our Lord, 'To day shalt thou be with me in paradise,' and, 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*.' There is no contradiction. He was in that part of *hades* which is called paradise. *America* is the general name of all this Western Continent, but *United States* is the happy part of America. So *hades* is the name of all the spirit-world, but paradise is the blessed part of that spirit-world." [2]

To this the radical replies: "This does not meet my objection

[1] C. W. Fitch. *The Intermediate State*, pp. 20, 21. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 27, 28.

to your theory. This question of *hades*, and its alleged divisions, is entirely foreign to the subject, and must be separately discussed. My argument may be stated thus:

"All the righteous when they die go to be with Christ;

"But Christ is in heaven;

"Therefore the righteous when they die go to heaven.

"You admit the major premise, and I am prepared to sustain the minor term by express assertions of Scripture. 'Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, *but into heaven itself*, now to appear in the presence of God for us.' [1] 'Our conversation is in heaven; *from whence* also we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.' [2] Stephen 'looked up steadfastly *into heaven*, and saw the glory of God, *and Jesus* standing on the right hand of God.' [3] 'The Lord himself shall descend *from heaven* with a shout.' [4] 'Your *Master also is in heaven*.' [5] '*Jesus Christ is gone into heaven*, and is on the right hand of God.' [6]

"These passages are decisive of the point in question; and the first two propositions being thus established, the conclusion inevitably follows, that the righteous when they die go to heaven."

The conservative cannot meet this argument, unless he can show that Christ is personally in *hades*, or there in the same sense that he is in heaven. This he cannot do; and his theory, therefore, fails.

Nor need the radicals confine their objections to a single passage. There are many other texts, quoted and relied upon alike by both parties, that—reasoning from the major premise as above—make directly against the detention of souls in *hades*. For instance: Eccl. 12: 7 is said to mean that at death the *soul* goes to God who gave it. But God is in heaven, whilst the conservatives say that the soul does not go at first to heaven but to *hades*. Again, Phil. 1: 21–23 is said to prove that all the righteous go at death to be with Christ. But Christ is in heaven, whilst the paradise of the conservatives is not in heaven, but in *hades*.

If, now, the advocates of these theories should say to the writer, Since you claim that we have overthrown each other's position concerning the state of the dead, perhaps you will oblige us by stating the true doctrine, he would reply: The true doc-

[1] Heb. 9: 24. [2] Phil. 3: 20. [3] Acts 7: 55. [4] 1 Thess. 4: 16. [5] Eph. 6: 9; Col. 4: 1. [6] 1 Pet. 3: 22.

UMI

trine is that of the Bible, which plainly teaches that the dead are asleep;[1] that they praise not the Lord;[2] that they are "in the land of forgetfulness;"[3] that they cannot hope for God's truth;[4] that "they know not anything."[5]

This theory is expressed in the language of Scripture, and therefore the burden of disproof lies with the party objecting thereto. Neither of the other theories is expressed in Scriptural terms. Where in the Bible can we find the doctrine stated that the righteous when they die go to heaven, or to a paradise in *hades?* Where in that sacred book are we told that when a wicked man dies his soul is seized by wicked angels and carried to hell, there to be tormented forever? Where is the divine authority for saying that the human soul is immaterial, or immortal, or that it is ever judged or rewarded or punished separate from the body? Where in the Holy Scriptures is it written that "the sainted dead are already before the throne and serve God day and night in his temple?" Can there be found in the whole Bible a single passage that teaches either directly or indirectly, by express assertion or fair implication, the incredible and truly intolerable doctrine, that all the wicked dead are at the present time tormented by wicked angels in some fearful abode of endless and ever-increasing misery?

The lovers of Bible truth have a right to demand that these questions be answered. I know very well the passages of Scripture that the radicals and conservatives cite as proof of their respective theories; and I know too that not one of them has the slightest relevance to the subject under discussion. The question is, What is the present state or condition of the dead? What do the Scriptures teach concerning it? Neither party has a right to begin the investigation of this question by *assuming as true* any disputed doctrine whatever. Let it be understood, then, that neither party has the right to *assume* that man is mortal or immortal, that the dead are conscious or unconscious. To do this would be equivalent to begging the question at the outset. Let the appeal, then, be made to those passages of Scripture in which the state of the dead is made the subject of comment or remark.

The testimony of Job concerning the intermediate state is very

[1] 1 Cor. 11:30; 15:6, 18, 51; 1 Thess. 4:13, 14, 15; 5:10; Ps. 13:3; 17:15; Is. 26:19; Dan. 12:2. [2] Ps. 115:17. [3] Ps. 88:12. [4] Is. 38:18. [5] Eccl. 9:5.

explicit. In the fourteenth chapter of his wonderful poem he declares that—

> "Man dieth, and wasteth away;
> Yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?
> *As* the waters fail from the sea,
> And the flood decayeth and drieth up:
> *So man lieth down, and riseth not:*
> *Till the heavens be no more,*[1]
> *They shall not awake,*
> *Nor be raised out of their sleep.*"

No comment could add force or clearness to this impressive passage of Scripture, in which it is expressly asserted that *the dead are asleep* and unable to *awake* therefrom until "the heavens be no more." Two other passages may, however, be appropriately quoted in this connection. In the closing chapter of Daniel's prophecy it is written: "Many of *them that sleep* in the dust of the earth shall *awake*, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Will it be said that this refers only to the state of dead *bodies* since the *soul* never sleeps? What then is meant by Isaiah's declaration—"Thy dead *men* shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. *Awake* and sing, ye that dwell in dust!"[2]

If it be true that the righteous go directly to heaven at death, or even to a paradise in *hades*, it is passing strange that not one of the inspired writers has ever mentioned the fact, either as an incentive to virtue, or as a consolation to surviving friends and relatives. Throughout the New Testament the interval between this life and the next, between this world and the world to come, is passed over as if it were nothing. Our Lord never speaks of a 'spirit-world,' and never promises a reward to any until his second advent. In reasoning with the Sadducees concerning the resurrection, he speaks of "the children of *this* world," and of them "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain *that* world," but says not a word about any world *between* death and resurrection. To one who had invited him to eat bread on the Sabbath, he said: "When thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for *thou shalt be recompensed* AT THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST."[3] If either of the orthodox theories were true, why did not the Great Teacher say, 'Thou shalt be recompensed at death?' This would have settled the whole question

[1] See 2 Pet. 3:10; Rev. 6:14; 21:1. [2] Is. 26:19. [3] Luke 14:13, 14.

at once. His words however as given by Luke, ought to decide the disputed point with all who believe the Bible, that the righteous are not recompensed until the resurrection of the just.

When Paul would administer consolation to the mourning ones at Thessalonica, he was not permitted "by the word of the Lord" to assure them that their deceased brethren were at that very moment partaking of the joys of heaven or paradise, and

"Drinking fresh draughts of endless pleasure in."

He was not permitted to sing with Dr. Watts—

"Why do ye mourn departing friends,
Or shake at death's alarms?
'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends
To call them to his arms."

Nor to indulge in the sentiment of Montgomery, who asks:

"Why mourn the pious dead?
Why sorrows swell our eyes?
* * * * * * * * *
In heaven the ransomed soul is seen."

It was permitted him, however, and that too by divine authority, to address to his bereaved brethren words which cheered their saddened hearts, and which have ever since been the source of comfort and consolation to millions of mourners in every Christian land. He begins by saying that he would not have them ignorant "concerning *them which sleep.*" "For," said he, "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so *them* also *which sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [go before] *them which are asleep.* For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the *dead in Christ* shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and *so* shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." [1]

Neither of the orthodox theories can be made to harmonize with the plain utterances of this most perspicuous passage. There are three points of marked contrast which should be carefully noted:

[1] 1 Thess. 4: 14-18.

1. The Apostle describes the dead as "*them which are asleep.*" Orthodoxy represents them as wide awake.

2. The Apostle represents the Lord as coming from heaven to receive all his saints both living and dead. Orthodoxy represents the saints as going one by one to the Lord in heaven.

3. Paul says: "*The dead* in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain [unto the coming of the Lord] shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall *we* ever be with the Lord." Orthodoxy says: 'The sainted dead are *already* before the throne, and serve God day and night in his temple.' [1]

Paul passes without remark over the intermediate state, and fixes all his hopes upon the second coming of Christ to raise the dead. In his first letter to the Corinthians he teaches the same doctrine in these words: "If the dead rise not,....then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."...."What advantageth it me if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink: for to-morrow we die." [2] Here the doctrine is plainly taught, that without a resurrection there can be no future life for the dead. But this cannot be true in any sense, if the righteous at death are admitted into the joys of heaven or paradise. For in such a case it is evident that it would matter quite as much how we passed the time of our probation here, as though we had to attain future life through a resurrection from the dead. The statements of the apostle and the theories of orthodox Protestants are thus seen to be irreconcilable. The doctrine of the sleep of the dead rests upon the firm foundation of the Gospel.

Aside from the main question, there are several collateral points to be considered, which constitute very grave objections to the orthodox theories. What we have called the radical view practically nullifies the doctrine of the resurrection by representing that the soul at death is invested with its appropriate spiritual body, in which it then ascends to heaven. It has long been taught in theological schools that all the dead are now existing as *disembodied* and *immaterial* souls. But this shadowy notion is fast giving way to the more substantial theory that each soul is at death clothed upon with its own appropriate body. Prof. Bush, who holds that the resurrection or *anastasis* of each individual takes place at death, is not accounted orthodox. But Mr. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, who is an orthodox radical

[1] *Bible Doc. of Im.*, p. 35. [2] 1 Cor. 15: 18, 32.

UMI

of the most approved stamp, has the boldness in his notes on 2 Cor. 5, to state the doctrine thus:

"The phrase 'to be clothed upon with our house' seems to be harsh and unusual. The sense is plain, however, that Paul desired to be invested with that pure, spiritual, and undecaying body which was to be the eternal abode of his soul in heaven. . . . The word 'clothed' refers to the spiritual body of believers; the eternal habitation in which they shall reside. In that future state *the soul will not be naked; i. e.*, destitute of any body or covering. The present body will be laid aside. It will return to corruption, and the disembodied spirit will ascend to God and to heaven. It will be disencumbered of the body with which it has so long been clothed. But we are not thence to infer that it will be destitute of a body; that it will remain a naked soul. It will be *clothed* there in its appropriate glorified body: and will have an appropriate habitation there. 'But clothed upon.' To be invested with our spiritual body. We desire to be clothed with that body."

Now this sounds like a very different gospel from that which Paul preached. If every Christian is invested at death with a spiritual body, which is to be "*the eternal abode of his soul in heaven*," what becomes of the doctrine of the resurrection? If the righteous dead are *already* in heaven; if they are *already* in the presence of God where there is fullness of joy, and pleasures for evermore; if they are *already* clothed with spiritual bodies; if they have *already* entered upon their reward, and are *already* equal unto the angels, the resurrection and the judgment-day are, to them, as though they had already been, or never were to be.

There is something extremely awkward, not to say absurd, in the notion that beings who have long since entered on a state of happiness or misery are to come from those abodes to be judged, and then to receive a formal award to the very condition which has long been familiar to them. To be in heaven or hell for ages, and then to stand at the judgment-seat of Christ to be judged; to hear the welcome—"Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," addressed to a class who had already entered upon their inheritance; to hear the dread sentence—"Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," addressed to a class who had already entered upon their punishment, scarcely looks consistent, but has the appearance rather of a theological fiction which has not one syllable in Scripture to give it countenance. Such representations—come from what source they may—seem but little better than mockeries of the most solemn scenes of future retribution.

Let it be understood, then, that the radical theory as stated by Mr. Barnes is irreconcilably opposed to the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection. Dr. Carmichael has plainly but truthfully observed: "It cannot be too often repeated: If there be an immortal soul there is no resurrection; and if there be any resurrection there is no immortal soul." [1]

Modern Spiritualism is commonly thought to be false in theory and pernicious in practice, yet its chief corner-stone and that of Protestant orthodoxy is the same. The immortality of the soul is a fundamental doctrine in the creed of each. The orthodox as well as the heterodox Spiritualism of the nineteenth century denies the necessity of a resurrection of the dead to enable them to communicate with the living. Dr. Fitch, a learned and venerable clergyman of the Episcopal church, in a recent work says:

"Abraham did not say it was because there was an impassable gulf betwixt the spirits of the just and the children of God in this world. There is *no such barrier*. . . . Blessed spirits departed *can revisit* the blessed on earth.

'When spirits made perfect meet spirits on earth,
'Tis good to be there.'

The souls of the departed do exist—shall we not say in angel form?—and do sometimes act as ministering spirits, sent forth to 'minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation.'" [2]

The Scriptures nowhere give the least countenance to *this* kind of Spiritualism, nor do they contain a promise to the righteous that they shall, in the intermediate state, be equal unto the angels. Our Lord said to the Sadducees: "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and *the resurrection from the dead*, neither marry, nor are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more: for *they* are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, BEING THE CHILDREN OF THE RESURRECTION." It is at the resurrection, then, and not at death, that the righteous are to be equal unto the angels. Then shall mortality be swallowed up of life; then shall this mortal put on immortality; then shall David awake and be satisfied, and then shall all the saints triumphantly shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O *Hades*, where is thy victory?"

[1] *Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture*, vol. II., p. 315.
[2] *The Intermediate State*, pp. 11, 12.

The dead are not praising God in heaven, nor cursing him in hell. They are asleep. They take no note of passing time. The voice of sorrow and the greetings of joy are alike unheeded by the inhabitants of the land of silence. The busy hum of industry and the ceaseless activities of life move on above them, but to them all is silent and unseen. The earthquake's shock and the thunder's roar send no sound within their narrow cell.

"The storm that wrecks the winter sky,
No more disturbs their deep repose
Than summer evening's latest sigh
That shuts the rose."

The flight of time can no longer be perceived by the senses, for the ear is deaf and the eye is closed. The silent sleepers are at rest. Earth's commotions, the march of mighty armies and the rise and fall of empires are unheeded by those who sleep in the dust. With them, joy and sorrow, love and hatred, no longer contend for the mastery. In the land of forgetfulness the miser no longer remembers his avarice, nor the conqueror his ambition. There are no inequalities of station there. The emperor and the serf, the king and the peasant, the rich and the poor, the haughty and the humble, share alike the cold hospitality of the grave.

"There the wicked cease from troubling;
And there the weary be at rest.
There the prisoners rest together;
They hear not the voice of the oppressor.
The small and the great are there;
And the servant is free from his master."[1]

[1] Job 3: 17-19.

CAN THE EARTH CONTAIN ITS INHABITANTS, IF THEY ARE RESURRECTED?

The assertion is often ignorantly or carelessly made, that if all mankind since Adam should be resurrected, the earth would not contain them. It has even been published that the earth's surface has been dug over one hundred and twenty-eight times for graves; that if all the dead were raised they would be "sixteen deep" upon its surface; and an intelligent member of an orthodox church once stated to the writer, that the earth had not soil enough to reconstruct all the bodies that have been interred in its bosom.

We wish to place before our readers some simple calculations,

with the figures, that they may have continually at hand an effective means for confounding the skeptic or spiritualizer who may urge the stupid objection to our hope, that the earth is not large enough for the resurrection and judgment.

It is estimated that at the present time about 33,000,000 of persons die every year. For the sake of the argument, we will make no account of the years during which earth was peopled, after the Creation; and repeopled after the Deluge; but assume that for six thousand years, 33,000,000 have died every year. Here is the multiplication in figures:

```
33,000,000
     6,000
-------------
198,000,000,000
```

The highest estimate of the present population of the world is 1,200,000,000; but we will call it..... 2,000,000,000

This gives us a total of..... 200,000,000,000

which is probably three times the number who have actually lived on the earth.

We next propose to find how much space these would occupy allowing each individual five square feet, and so multiply the above number by..... 5

1,000,000,000,000

One trillion of square feet would furnish standing-room for all the vast multitude.

In the State of Michigan there are 56,243 square miles. In each square mile there are 27,878,400 square feet. Let us multiply again, omitting the odd hundreds in the square miles:

```
27,878,400
    56,000
-------------
167,170,400
139,392,000
-------------
5)1,561,090,400,000
-------------
312,218,080,000
```

And the multiplication gives us the number of square feet in the State of Michigan. Dividing this by five, the number of square feet allowed each individual, we shall find that this State alone would contain (persons).....

or upwards of one hundred billions more than the above extravagant estimate of the entire race of Adam.

When we consider how every possible advantage is given to the skeptic in the above calculation, how exceedingly weak and foolish is the objection to the resurrection, that earth would not afford standing room for those who sleep in its dust. It can, we repeat, be urged only by the ignorant or the careless.

EDITORIAL.

THE promised work—*The Doctrine of Immortality*—by Eld. James H. Whitmore has been published, meets with a ready sale, and is received with great favor. It will take its place at once as a standard work, and must exert a lively and healthful influence in favor of the *Bible* doctrine of the nature of man and his future destiny. Our ministers, and others, can both help themselves and aid the cause of truth by engaging in the sale of this work. It is offered by the Association upon really liberal terms in order to secure for it the wide circulation it deserves. Do not be without a copy.

WE were requested to send a copy of the January number of THE QUARTERLY to the Rev. D. A. Whedon, D. D., of Bristol, R. I. The result was a new appeal to the prejudice we deprecated, made through the columns of *The Christian Advocate*. He calls us "Christian Sadducees." Now it is, of course, true that the Sadducees denied that there was in man "even a *mortal* immaterial soul or spirit which as a conscious entity survives in death." They denied "the existence of a soul distinct from the body." But does this justify Dr. Whedon in holding us up to his Methodist brethren as Christian Sadducees? This sect were frequently denounced by the Savior in unmeasured terms. The disciples were bid to beware of both their doctrine and morals; and their name is inseparably connected in the mind of the intelligent Christian with these stern denunciations. Therefore when a people are styled 'Christian Sadducees,' the associations connected with the epithet are such as are calculated to awaken the keenest prejudices against them. We will not affirm that Dr. Whedon thus stigmatized us with the conscious, deliberate intention of awaking a blind prejudice against Adventism in the minds of his readers. Certainly, if, as he affirms, the weight of argument is all on his side, he *need* not resort to such weapons. But a skillful appeal to *prejudice* in the very outset of an argument indicates reliance upon rhetoric rather than logic.

Let us examine the grounds upon which the charge that we are Sadducees rest. We will put it in the form of a syllogism.

The Sadducees denied the existence of the soul as a conscious entity distinct from the body;

Adventists deny the existence of the soul as a conscious entity distinct from the body;

Therefore, Adventists are Sadducees.

Now the above conclusion would be legitimate if the premises were fair: but they are *not* fair; for while the Sadducees believed, as Adventists do, that death is a state of unconsciousness, they also denied that there was either angel or spirit, resurrection of the dead, or future life for mankind, all of which Adventists steadfastly affirm. But let us apply the Doctor's method of reasoning to himself.

The Buddhists believe that man is conscious in death;

Dr. Whedon believes that man is conscious in death;

Therefore, Dr. Whedon is a Buddhist.

And we could go on in the same style of reasoning and prove him a Mohammedan, a Roman Catholic, a Pagan, a disciple of Zoroaster, of Confucius, of Plato, of Joe Smith, of Ann Lee, of Andrew Jackson Davis, and the Fox girls. Else he must claim that *his* is one of those rules which will not "work both ways;" and if so, he had best abandon its further use.

Of course it is useless for us to plead that the discussion of this question shall proceed upon its merits. Prof. Bartlett is not the only opponent we have who insists upon the use of certain terms as indispensable in attacking our views. Our assailants seemingly dare not risk their argument before intelligent men until they have first created the strongest possible bias against our, and in favor of their own views. On the other hand, whether acting on the defensive or the offensive, we have to meet not only whatever of logic they are able to summon; but are compelled to make our way against misrepresentations, misconceptions, the carefully fostered prejudices of education and association, intolerance, narrow-minded bigotry, and obstinate dogmatism. All these are arrayed against us; and our opposers show that they appreciate the effectiveness of such weapons by the free use they make of them.

Says Dr. Whedon: "It is not a little singular that a sect of self-styled Christians should have adopted the materialistic theory for whose sake infidels have rejected Christianity as incompatible with it, and pronounce it the genuine doctrine of Christianity itself."

This sentence is skillfully put: dissected, it is an assertion that Adventists teach the theory advanced by infidel materialists. And further on he says again that one might as well "talk of Christian Infidelity" as of "Christian Materialism." This amounts to an assertion that one *must be an immaterialist* or else be an infidel: to doubt immaterialism, is to deny Christianity. Again, we challenge the fairness and Christian courtesy of any opponent who will take advantage of the fact that *some* of an antagonist's positions are held by a school of infidels, and endeavor to confound his theory with that of the unbelievers. Which system of infidelity is making the most alarming inroads upon Christianity to-day: that of the materialist or the immaterialist schools? Suppose we should gravely charge the immaterialist Doctor with being a Spiritualist?—and the world has seen no worse form of infidelity. Yet he holds as many, or more articles of faith in common with them, than we do in common with the infidel materialists. Here again Dr. Whedon has taken his weapon by the blade; or we might say, thrown his 'boomerang' so unskillfully that it has returned upon his own pate.

UMI

Again he says: "In defining terms they [Adventists] sometimes say that spirit means *breath* when referring to man, and soul means animal life, or vital principle. This is sometimes true, and sometimes it is false, as in the passage, 'I pray God your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,' which becomes a prayer in behalf of the breath of the Thessalonians, consisting of oxygen and nitrogen inhaled and exhaled, their vital principle, and their bones and muscles, as if mere matter could be responsible."

Now Dr. Whedon has here placed himself in a dilemma, and must either plead ignorance or willful misrepresentation. He may seat himself on whichever of the two horns pleases him best. He has intimated that Adventists teach that spirit *always* means breath, and soul *always* means the vital principle; and the form of his charge, which, avoiding a direct statement, is still a clear intimation, indicates that the second horn of the dilemma in which he finds himself is his only choice: for no Adventist ever, any where (that we ever heard of), asserted what the Doctor intimates. They do assert, and prove, that the words soul and spirit have various meanings; and that, as in the case of any other word with primary and secondary significations, the context and sense of the passage determine their meaning in any given case. If the Doctor had said that Adventists "say—that *sometimes* spirit means breath," etc., he would have stated the exact truth, which he himself also must believe.

In the very next paragraph to the one quoted above, the Doctor says of the word "soul"—"under which term WE *include* what in Scripture psychology *is implied in both soul and spirit*." Now if he may take the liberty to include *soul* and *spirit* in one entity, can he reasonably complain if on the same principle we include *all three* in one entity, and understand Paul's prayer to be that the Thessalonians might in *their entire nature* be kept holy, or "preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord?" If the Doctor can prove that their nature included an immaterial immortal soul; intangible, indivisible, and without form, that of course will be included in the petition: but this text does not prove the existence of such an entity in the make-up of man. (Further remarks are crowded out.)

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I.

NUMBER 1. An Apology, by Eld. Joshua V. Himes; Truth and Love—Letter to a Clergyman, by the Rev. Samuel Minton; Christianity vs. Churchianity, by Eld. A. A. Phelps; Paul's "Desire to Depart," by Thos. Davidson; The Kingdom of God, by Eld. L. C. Collins: An Approaching Change, from *The North British Review;* Life and Death, by Eld. James H. Whitmore: The Signs, by the Rev. Horatius Bonar; Editorial.

NUMBER 2. The Comforting Hope, by Eld. O. R. Fassett; First Things and First Thoughts on Awaking, Anon; Evening by Evening (Poetry), Bonar; The Trinity, by Eld. E. Royce; Has He Come? by Eld. Geo. Thomson; Missionary Theology, by the Rev. Edward White; The Second Advent, Selected; Editorial.

NUMBER 3. The Gospel Preached to Abraham, by the Editor; The Blissful Vision (Poetry), by J. Albert Libby; The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment, by the Rev. Henry Constable: The Saint's Joy and Sorrow, from *The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy;* The Use and Value of the Term "Aion," by Thomas De Quincy; The Return of the Lord Jesus Christ, from *The Rainbow;* "Ascension Robes," by the Editor: Editorial.

NUMBER 4. Immaterialism; or, Soul-Immortality Refuted, by Eld. Wm. Sheldon; The Throne of David, by Eld. Frank Burr: A Review of Prof. Bartlett's "Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation," by the Rev. Henr Constable: The Errors of the Age, from *The London Quarterly Journal of Prophecy;* Hades and Heaven, by Eld. James H. Whitmore; Can the Earth Contain Its Inhabitants, if They Are Resurrected, by the Editor; Editorial.

UMI

Lord teaches that he would raise to life those who had believed in him, but were already dead; while of living believers he asserts they "shall never die;" that is, according to the literal rendering of the Greek, "they shall not die forever." They shall not die in the absolute sense in which the term 'second death' is used, but their death will be a falling asleep in Jesus.[1]

It will not do to spiritualize the words 'life,' and 'he shall live,' 'dead,' and 'shall not die forever;' for there is no question raised either in the text or context about spiritual death and life, nor about happiness and misery.

Once more: in ch. 12: 25, our Lord, in addressing the Greeks who came up to worship at the feast, uses this remarkable language: "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

No ingenuity of reasoning can make this passage teach the popular doctrine. It is utterly opposed to the idea that men have eternal life in themselves. For it is plain that a man cannot lose his life and have it at the same time; yet our Lord declares "he that loveth his life *shall* lose it." What is it which a man is here represented as loving? And what is it that he will keep unto life eternal if he hate it in this world? The obvious answer to these questions must carry with it the conviction to every unbiased mind, that Christ is truly the *Life-giver*, in the sense that he gives the pricelesss boon of IMMORTALITY to all who love and obey him.

The great theme upon which Christ and his apostles delighted to dwell was life, *eternal life.* Well did Peter say unto his Lord, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." (John 6: 68.) An inspired apostle has declared that "Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." (2 Tim. 1: 10.) This revelation was brought about by the personal resurrection of Christ, who afterwards appearing to John in Patmos, says (Rev. 1: 18): "I am he that *liveth* and was dead; and behold I am *alive* for evermore." When we read this sublime utterance, our hearts are cheered with the hope of life, for we remember that precious promise of the Life-giver, "Because I live, ye shall live also." (John 14: 19.) He might just as easily have said, "Because I am happy, ye shall be happy also;" but this would not have been the full or radical idea intended. He and his apostles uniformly use the more comprehensive term "life," without which no other good is possible.

[1] Another exposition makes this promise refer to the living saints at the second coming of Christ. See 1 Thess. 4: 15; 1 Cor. 15: 21.

But it may be asked, Will not the future life of the redeemed be a happy one? Most assuredly it will; but we do not get this idea from the word life itself, but from those passages of Scripture in which the felicity of those who receive the gift of life, is specifically mentioned.

The question at issue is not whether Christ bestows mere existence only, but whether he bestows existence at all. The Orthodox position is, that he is the bestower of happiness *only;* that men are not dependent upon him for future *life*, as they are naturally immortal, and consequently deathless.

The utter absence of any necessity for substituting the word 'happiness' for 'life,' when the latter term is applied to describe the future state of the righteous, is seen from the following language of Scripture:

"Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." (1 Cor. 2: 9.) "In thy presence is FULLNESS OF JOY; at thy right hand are PLEASURES FOR EVERMORE." (Ps. 16: 11.)

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, *I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am there ye may be also.*" (John 14: 2, 3.) "We shall ever be with the Lord." (1 Thess. 4: 17.) "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, YE BLESSED *of my Father*, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (Matt. 25: 34.)

"*Blessed* and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." (Rev. 20: 6.)

"And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, *and God himself shall be with them, and be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be* NO MORE DEATH, *neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain*, for the former things are passed away." (Rev. 21: 3, 4.)

What a magnificent destiny awaits the faithful follower of Christ! To be forever with the Lord; to share in the pure pleasures of the angels; to be forever free from all pain and sorrow; to be assured that perfect peace will never be disturbed by the corroding cares of mortal life—all this will be inexpressibly glorious!

If a righteous man has even in this world, while fully trusting